

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LVII.

JANUARY, 1864.

ARTICLE I.

THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.—THE CALL TO THE GOSPEL
MINISTRY.*

By REV. M. LOY, A. M., Delaware, Ohio.

WE have endeavored to render it plain that although every Christian is a priest, yet not every one is a pastor. All have equal rights, but equality of rights does not imply possession of the same office. The incumbent of the ecclesiastical office exercises common rights not in his own name, but in that of those who hold the rights in common. He is the agent of the community whose common rights are exercised by the office. Such agent cannot appoint himself, but must be chosen by the persons for whom he is to act. Hence the necessity of a call to the Gospel Ministry.

§1. *No one has the right to exercise the functions of the priesthood, or the power of the keys, publicly in the Church, without a call.*

This is evident from Holy Scripture and from reason, from the Symbols and the best writers of our Church.

* *Vide* Evangelical Review, Vol. XIII. p. 299.

I. The Holy Scriptures, while their teachings in reference to the common rights of the Christian priesthood are quite explicit, just as manifestly teach that none should presume to exercise common rights in the Church without common consent. The Lord prohibits such arrogance. When He wants men to minister He will call them; whether He does so immediately, as in extraordinary cases, or mediately, through the Church, as ordinarily, the prerogative is His, and the sin of officiating without a mission is heinous. His controversy with false prophets in ancient times was not only on account of their falsehoods, but also on account of their officious running without a vocation. For thus saith the Lord: "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied; Jer. 23: 21. Indeed, the two sins of teaching lies and teaching without authority are intimately connected. For the inflated self-conceit which induces a man to think he must needs be a public teacher, because of his transcendent abilities, even though the Church should be too stupid to appreciate them, and the wild enthusiasm which prompts the fanatic to imagine himself especially called of God to enlighten the world, even though benighted Christendom failed to perceive it, are not likely to draw their possessors to the word of truth to learn God's will in meekness there. In the New Testament the necessity of being sent in order to be a legitimate preacher in the Church is expressly asserted. "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they are sent?" Rom. 10: 14, 15. That they are sent by the Lord, whose truth they preach and in whose name they preach it, is undeniable, and is just as little denied by those who insist according to Scripture, that the call comes from the congregation, as by those who maintain that it comes directly from the Lord or through the pastorate. All are agreed that the call is necessary, and this is what we are at present concerned in showing. To this the manifold examples recorded in the Scriptures also bear testimony. "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Heb. 5: 4. Of the Levitical priesthood it is said: "The Lord hath chosen you to stand before Him, to serve Him, and that ye should minister unto Him and burn incense before Him." 2 Chron. 29: 11. And as these ordinary pas-

tors of the people were divinely called, so were the extraordinary teachers who are styled prophets. Isaiah declares: "I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I, send me. And he said go." Is. 6: 8, 9. Jeremiah says: "The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Jer. 1: 4, 5. Ezekiel testifies that the Lord said to him: "Son of man I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that hath rebelled against me * * I do send thee unto them; and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God." Ez. 2: 3, 4. And "the word of the Lord came to Jonah, the son of Amitai, saying, Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it." Indeed, no intelligent reader of the Bible could suppose that any true prophet of God ever ran when he was not sent; they could be God's messengers only when God commissioned them. And so it was also in the new dispensation from the beginning, and is so now. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." Of the harbinger of this merciful dispensation it is said: "There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe." Jno. 1: 6, 7. The first preachers of the glad tidings that the Saviour had come, were called and sent as messengers to fallen man. "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. 10: 5, 7. And the same is true of all their successors in the pastoral office. Elders were ordained in every Church, receiving the ministerial calling and ministerial commission. Acts 14: 23; Tit. 1: 5. So it must ever be; for the command is to go into all the world and teach all nations, and this is to be continued unto the end of the world. Matt. 28: 19, 20; wherefore we are instructed to "pray the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth laborers into His harvest." Matt. 9: 38. Without such mission and call the Scriptures know no right to administer the pastoral office.

II. From the premises furnished by inspiration, moreover, reason readily deduces the necessity of such call. For that which is equally the property of all cannot be administered by one without the consent of the rest. But we have seen that the Lord has conferred the keys upon the Church, not upon select individuals within her pale. To officiate without a call is therefore a violation of the rights of the Christian community. It is at once a sin against the Lamb who grants and the Bride who receives them. That each individual Christian possesses the keys and is entitled to their administration is true; but to infer from this that each one may, therefore, administer them in any place and manner he pleases is as unreasonable as it is unscriptural. The logical inference is just the reverse of this, so far as the public administration in the Church is concerned. Privately each one exercises his right as best he can, and spreads the truth in love according to the ability which the Lord bestows. As long as the individual, in the exercise of his rights, does not encroach upon the rights of other individuals, no one is authorized to interfere. But it must be apparent to every one who is willing to see, that just as soon as each exercise assumes a public form in the congregation something more than the rights of an isolated individual enter into the question. The individual is then merged in the congregation; he is no longer isolated. One has just as much right to administer the means of grace as another. All are equally privileged. They are one in Christ, striving to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. They act as a corporation, not as a mass of incoherent particles. It is totally at variance with any adequate idea of an organized community in general, and with the idea of a Christian Church as presented in the Bible in particular, to suppose that each member of the body may act, in matters pertaining to all, without any regard to the other members. Indeed, according to such a doctrine the Church could never assume a visible form on earth; there might be Christian individuals, but certainly no organized Christian congregation. But the Holy Spirit gathers the people of God. They are joined together in one heart and one mind. In such union they live and love and labor; in such union they publicly administer the means of grace. Thus the Master wills, thus the Holy Spirit prompts. For such administration they must necessarily appoint agents. The word cannot be preached by the thousand lips in the congregation at once, nor the

sacraments administered by the thousand hands. These agents are the ministers of the Church. They exercise the rights of all, and do it in the name of all. But this they can do only when called to such office. To pretend to act for others without their appointment or consent is palpable arrogance, and tramples upon their rights. For since Christians have all things in common, as we have shown and proved, it could not be right for one to push himself forward and appropriate to himself what belongs to us all. Let him maintain this right, and exercise it, where there is no other person who has also received it. But this is required by the rights of the community, that one, or as many as the congregation chooses, should be elected and accepted, who shall administer the offices publicly in the place and name of all those who have precisely the same rights." Luther's W. 10, 1857. And as this is the only way in which the rights of all can be preserved inviolate while all are discharging the duty of disseminating the truth, so it is the only possible way in which the decency and order enjoined in the word of God can be maintained without sacrificing these rights. The Church would become a Babel if each one, confounding the possession of a right with the authority publicly to exercise it in the Church, would consider himself a public functionary. When it is granted that all have an equal right to the keys, and that the Lord requires all things to be done decently and in order, it follows by inevitable necessity that one must be called to the public office before he can lawfully administer it. Nor can we see any objection to this in the diversity of gifts with which men are endowed. That such diversity exists is confessed by all. But this does not imply that the requisite endowments will or can elevate their possessors to the pastoral office without a vocation. An arrangement by which the possession of the necessary qualifications should in itself endue a person with pastoral prerogatives would neither preserve order nor rights. For in some places there are many who have the qualifications needed, and the public exercise of their gifts, in the absence of any designation of those among them who should officiate, could only result in confusion. Besides, there are always many who suppose themselves to possess that, of which they are utterly devoid. If each person were left to determine for himself whether he has the qualifications required for the ministry, it must be obvious to all who have any knowledge of human nature in its ruined condition that not a few would

rush into the office without the proper gifts, and many who possess them would be deterred from entering upon it by that very meekness and humility which render them specially fitted for it. The apostle deemed it necessary to exhort even Christians not to think of themselves more highly than they ought to think, and not all who are found in the visible congregation are even Christians. It is not for the individual to be the judge of his own abilities; others can do this much better, and others are appointed to do it in the case of a candidate for the ministry. The call to the office is the proper recognition of the candidate's gifts. And it need not be at all feared that those, who have the requisite gifts of grace, will quarrel with the Church for choosing others, if she sees fit, rather than themselves to the holy office. They will rather rejoice that others are deemed better qualified than they, and will use their own abilities in the sphere which Providence assigns them, fully and justly assured that if God wants them in the ministry He will find them, and call them in the proper way, and that if he assigns them some other vocation, His assignment is their advantage. God bestows gifts in order that there may be proper persons to whom to extend the call, not by any means to render the call superfluous. And as order can be maintained only by such designation of persons to administer the office, not by the mere existence of requisite gifts, so can the common rights of Christians be preserved only in this way. For the fact that one has more talents than another does not give him higher privileges in the kingdom of God; he is a king and priest like all other believers, and nothing more. To say that he has the office because he has the gifts, is to make great Christian rights dependent on endowments which cannot be deemed essential to Christian character. Against this every believer should feel bound to enter his solemn protest. We are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and we cannot possibly be more. But if those who are less gifted than others have still the same rights as those who have the highest abilities, which cannot be denied, it is just as undeniable that their consent must be obtained before those common rights can be exercised in their name, in other words, the agent must be called by those for whom he acts. They should choose the person who is qualified, but the choice, not the qualification, constitutes the minister. The conclusion from plain Bible

truths is unavoidable that no one can lawfully hold the office without a call to this effect. And

III. In accordance with this, our Symbols also, teach when they declare, as already shown, that "Concerning Church government it is taught that no one should teach or preach publicly in the Church, or administer the sacraments, without a regular call." (Augs. Conf. 14.) No words can be plainer. A clear distinction is made between public teaching and private, and between teaching in the Church, and in places where the Church is not yet established. The means of grace are every Christian's inheritance, and the duty of administering them for the conversion of souls and the edification of the Church is implied in their possession. Such administration is not only an inalienable right but, because it is God's will that souls should be saved by the employment of these means, a solemn duty. The Christian therefore exercises the functions of his priesthood in his own family, not in virtue of a right communicated by the pastor of the congregation, but in virtue of the right communicated by his Lord to him, as to every other believer, through faith. So he counsels and admonishes and comforts his brethren in his private intercourse with them, not because he has received a special congregational call or pastoral vocation to do this, but because as a spiritual priest and as possessor of the keys through faith he has an immediate invitation from the Lord to do it, as every believer has. This the article obviously implies. It is much to be desired that those who are sincere in their efforts to understand the doctrine of the Lutheran Church would give attention to the careful wording of the Confession. It does not say that no one should teach or preach without a call. It would not say the truth, if it said this and meant, by the word a vocation call, from the Church. Nor would the practice of the Church have corresponded with it. For it never was claimed that she made or now makes a congregational call necessary to authorize a believer to teach privately. No one who will fairly examine the article, with its guarded expressions and well defined limitations, can conclude that teaching and preaching, as such, require a regular call. No one should teach or preach *publicly* without a call. But there is still another qualification, which shows that the rule requiring a vocation does not only not apply to the activity of believers in their private relations, but not even to the public exercise of their priestly functions in all cases. Where no

Church exists, no call is requisite. A believer whose lot is cast among the heathen need not wait for a vocation to authorize him to preach to them the unsearchable riches of Christ. Whence, indeed, should he receive a call? No intelligent Christian would, we trust, so far forget his character and calling as a Christian, as to accept a call from the heathen, while still remaining such, to become their minister and pastor. When a number of believers has once gathered by the divine means, they must call some one to the pastoral office; but until there are such it would be absurd to speak of a regular call among them. The single Christian is called to win their souls to Christ; he has not only a right to teach them the truth, but would manifest a want of faith and charity if he refused to do it when circumstances permitted. Nor need he shun publicity in doing it: he should pity their benighted souls and bring them to the marvellous light of the Gospel as best he can, privately or publicly. "It is taught that no one should teach or preach publicly in the Church without a regular call." The Church has stated her doctrine with precision and abides by it with firmness. She has no wavering faith nor hesitating expression. She is careful to curtail no privilege and encroach upon no right of the lowliest believer, for her treasure is the treasure of believers. But as the welfare of the congregation, and the rights of believers associated in the congregation require that the public administration of the means of grace should be conferred upon and, where possible, confined to persons called to this office, and as God has been pleased to command such order, she maintains the rights of the ministry, as the divinely instituted representatives of the congregation, just as sedulously as the rights of the spiritual priesthood of all believers. Whatever her enemies may say to the contrary, her Confessions, while affirming that the keys are given originally and immediately to the Church, condemn all those false theories which lead to anarchy and confusion in their public administration, and insists that none should presume to act as a public officer without being duly called. And, as we have abundantly shown, the uniform doctrine of her most distinguished teachers accords with this. We know of none, indeed, who ever taught otherwise within her limits. Some have been charged with doing so, but falsely. Especially was this the case in reference to Luther. But we have already quoted passages in which he expressly denies the unjust accusation. His works everywhere deny it, even if

it had not been done expressly. The papists so little understood his defense of the Christian's rights that they naturally supposed him to identify the spiritual priesthood and ecclesiastical pastorate. Besides this, they trembled for their honors and emoluments, and not without reason. Such a distinction as they made between the laity and the clergy he never acknowledges. Their unscriptural priesthood he did indeed labor to undermine and overthrow, for it robbed the people of their noblest rights and stripped them of their choicest privileges in the Church. With this Luther's doctrine was and is inconsistent. But he never uttered a single word in conflict with the scriptural doctrine of the Christian ministry: on the contrary he said and wrote much to defend and elucidate it as a divine institution, not to lord it over God's heritage, but to minister in the Church, where all are one in Christ, though their offices be different.

§2. *The Call is given mediately through the Congregation only.*

The call to the pastoral office is not given immediately, but mediately, and the medium employed is the congregation, not some different power.

1. The call is not given immediately. It always comes from the Lord and renders the called person in an especial sense a servant of the Lord. But this does not imply that God must give the call immediately, since a mediate call is just as much divine as an immediate one.

1. There have been pastors and teachers who were immediately called. This all who read the Scriptures know. To the prophets under the old dispensation the word of the Lord came directly and called them to their exalted mission immediately, as the extraordinary character of their office would lead us to expect. And the same is true of the first preachers of the Gospel after the advent of Christ: the apostles were all called to their great work immediately by the Lord. In both these cases it could not well be otherwise. A new order was to be introduced, and this of course must break in on the accustomed and ordinary course of things. Beginnings are always, in the nature of the case, different from the normal condition of things established. The first disciples were called to the marvellous light of the Gospel, as well as to an apostleship under it immediately by the Lord; but it is plain that the ordinary vocation into God's kingdom is given in a different way since the Lord is no

longer visibly present among men, and so is also the ordinary vocation to the office of the Church. Not that it is essential in itself that the call should be mediate, or that God could not give it without the Church. He has conferred it immediately, and no power could prevent Him from doing it again, if it thus seemed good in His sight. But, although they have been, yet

2. Persons are not immediately called to the ministry now. The case of the apostles proves no rule in this respect. If all the circumstances were now the same we could appeal to the fact of the immediateness of their call in proof of the immediateness of the call in general. But the rule is that the call should be mediate, and the circumstances in the cases of immediateness show why they are to be properly regarded as exceptions. The prophetic office was established not as the regular pastorate in the old dispensation, but in addition to it, as a remedy for evils growing out of the unfaithfulness of those who were incumbents of the regular office. Extraordinary officers could of course not be expected to receive their commissions in the ordinary way. The apostolic office was a means of founding the Church in its specifically Christian form. A Church must be organized before it can call its pastors. This fact, which is self-evident, is generally overlooked by those who argue against congregational rights on the ground of apostolic practice. The pastors of our present churches are not apostles, although the apostles were the first incumbents of the ministerial office. These lived and labored in peculiar circumstances and were endowed with peculiar powers. They were missionaries to organize congregations, and missionaries in a different sense from those which are sent forth now, inasmuch as their calling was to be inspired messengers to establish Christianity upon earth. Their field was the whole world, and their miraculous powers attested their divine mission and the truth of their message. All this should be considered by those who think the whole question of the ministry settled by a mere reference to the nature and powers of the apostleship. Of persons claiming an immediate call, or the whole world as their field of labor, and on this ground refusing to admit the necessity of the Church's call and to respect its assignment of a special parish, to which their labors must be confined, we must demand miracles also in proof of their apostolic character and commission, the absence of which evinces their claims to be mere arrogance. And if they will not subject them-

selves to the biblical tests of an extraordinary mission, they should certainly be willing, if disposed to be at all reasonable, to limit their claims to the ordinary office, and subject themselves to the regulations bearing upon it. They should not expect Christians to respect their pretensions, when they claim extraordinary powers, without a single evidence to establish their claim. They should expect rather to be rebuked for their presumption or pitied for their simpleness. Evidence sufficient to satisfy men of a call must always be given, not because the efficacy of the means of grace depends on the validity of the administrator's call, but because the order and peace of the Church requires the call to be respected, and this can of course be only, where its possession is known. The mediate call is given by a congregation and publicly certified, that whosoever will may know it. How should or could the immediate call be known and certified otherwise than it is in the cases recorded in Scripture, namely, by signs and wonders? When there can exist no certificate of men who witnessed the call, there must be this certificate of God, which all the prophets and apostles had. Those who come as teachers without such testimony must be rejected. Imposters are easily discovered in this way. "When they are asked about their vocation, and requested to say who told them to creep hither and come and preach in a corner, they are unable to answer and show their commission. And I say the truth, if such creepers were guilty of no other offense, and were otherwise pure saints, this one fact that they come without commission and call, is sufficient to prove them messengers and teachers of the devil. For the Holy Ghost does not creep, but flies openly from heaven. Serpents creep, but doves fly * * Here there is no other remedy but that both spiritual and temporal offices interfere. The spiritual must constantly and diligently instruct the people, that they may admit no creeper, but may recognize them as messengers of Satan, and ask them: Whence camest thou? Who sent thee? Who has commanded thee to preach to me? Where are thy papers and seal certifying that thou art sent by men? Where are thy miracles to show that thou art sent by God? Why dost thou not go to our pastor? Why dost thou secretly come to me and creep in a corner? Why dost thou not stand forth publicly? If thou art a child of light why dost thou fear the light? With such questions they could easily, I think, be driven back; for they cannot prove their call." Luther 39, 215-6. "In a

word, St. Paul will not tolerate the presumption and guilt of meddling with other men's matters; each is to attend to his own business and vocation and leave others unmolested in attending to theirs. Then he may be wise, and teach and sing and read and explain, where he has authority to do it, until he is tried. If God desires, beside and above this order of offices and the call, to do something extraordinary and call some one apart from the prophets, He will prove this by miracles and signs, as He commanded the ass to speak and rebuke the prophet Baalam, her master. Num. 22: 28. Where He does not do this we should adhere to the appointed offices and commission and act accordingly." Ib. 223. As we are urged to beware of false prophets and to labor for the preservation of peace and order in the Church, we cannot, according to the Scriptures, regard a call which is not proved, and must reject all claims to an immediate call which, being extraordinary, is not extraordinarily certified by miracles. Such call and certification we have no reason to expect in these times, whilst the regular call to the regular office continues now as ever.

II. This call is given through the congregation. So the Scriptures teach, and so, in accordance with them, the Church teaches. In proof of this we offer the following evidence.

1. The Church must give the call, because she alone has the priesthood and can, therefore, alone confer the right of publicly exercising it. That the Church, and every individual member of the Church, possesses the spiritual priesthood, has already been proved. The inference from this is obvious. What the Church possesses can be conferred only by the Church; and he who takes it without her consent and without having it immediately bestowed by the Lord, the original owner and donor, must be justly styled a thief and a robber. The ministerial office exercises functions which belong to all priests: it is instituted for the public administration of Christian gifts and privileges. The officer is the public agent of the Church, exercising common rights in the name of all. Who shall appoint such officer and agent? When it is promptly answered, The Lord appoints him, expression is given to a manifest truth. The rights exercised and the means administered and the gifts imparted are all originally His, and all authority over them must of course remain His. But the husband surrenders no rights and titles when he makes his wife a partner in his possessions;

the Lamb ceases not to be proprietor and ruler of all because He mercifully confers great gifts and privileges upon His Bride, the Church. The Lord appoints the pastor, certainly; but He does it not immediately; He does it not, in such a way, as to ignore the Church with the manifold privileges which He has Himself conferred upon her; He does it through His wife, whom He has made partner in the ownership of the sacerdotal powers which are exercised in the ministry. There exists no other authority by which the office could be conferred. The Lord was pleased to bestow on the believers the rights which it exercises, and to appoint the election of proper persons publicly to exercise them on behalf of all. The rights are lodged nowhere else but in the Church, and the authority to elect an agent to exercise them cannot be given to a body, different from that whose rights are to be exercised. No call can be valid, excepting the extraordinary immediate call, unless the Church confers it, or at least consents to it and thus grants authority to officiate. This inference is expressly drawn in our Symbols, and no one can doubt its Lutheran character, even if he were disposed to deny its Scripturalness. Among the proofs presented to establish the Church's right to elect pastors occurs this: "Finally, this is also confirmed by the words of St. Peter, when he says: 'Ye are a royal priesthood.' These words refer to the true Church which, because she alone has the priesthood, must also have the power to elect and ordain ministers of the Church." (341, 69.) Nothing can be plainer than this argument: the Church has the priesthood, and therefore she must have the authority to appoint persons to exercise it. It is found frequently in the works of our theologians. Luther shows, in opposition to Emser, that no human ceremonies and no functions make a priest, but that "the priesthood and power must exist before, received in Baptism, common to all Christians through faith, by which they are built on Christ, the true High Priest, as St. Peter here declares. But to exercise such power and put it in practice is not proper for every person; this must be left to those who are called by the congregation or by those who have the congregation's command and will, who then act instead and in the name of the people and by common authority." 27: 316. It will be observed that Luther does not make it essential that the congregation should be immediately active in the election; nor has the Church ever deemed this essential.

But without the people who have the priesthood there can be no valid call to its exercise. They may call the minister immediately, or they may delegate the right of calling to an ecclesiastical council, or even to the State, only so that it be their right which is exercised. Hence Luther says: "Every one who would be a Christian should be certain, and should well consider it, that we are all alike priests, that is, that we all have equal authority in reference to the divine word and the holy sacraments. But it is proper for each one not to use them except by the consent of the congregation or the call of the superiors. For what belongs equally to all none can claim for himself in particular unless he is called." (W. 19: 139.) Those who have the priesthood can call persons or have them called to the office; but it is a manifest usurpation of others' rights to officiate without the call of those who possess the priesthood.

2. The Church must give the call because she alone has the keys. The fact of such possession we have also proved in the former article. But if she alone has the keys it follows of necessity that she alone can lawfully use them, and appoint the agent to do this in her stead, as she cannot do it without such agency. This inference is also drawn in the Symbols, where the argument to prove the congregation's right of calling, as based on the possession of the keys, stands thus: "To this place belong the words of Christ which testify that the keys are given to the whole Church, not to several special persons, as the text declares, where two or three are gathered together in my name, &c. (341: 68.) The Church, not some select persons, has the keys. They exist in the congregation, no matter how small it may be; where there are two or three, the Church's rights exist. But if the keys are not given to some select individuals, it cannot be claimed that they alone have the right of calling ministers to exercise them, as the papists dream; if they are given to the whole Church, the whole Church, not only the clergy, have the power to call the officers whose business it is to use them: whenever, as is declared in the paragraph preceding the words quoted, the Church is, there is the command to preach the Gospel, and there must accordingly be the power to choose and ordain ministers; and wherever such are needed, no matter how little the flock which is assembled in Jesus' name, the flock, having the keys, has the duty and of course the right of appointing them. And this argument the writers of our Church have always found co-

gent. It is used by them as an irrefragable proof of the proposition under consideration. "This is and must be our ground and firm rock, that where the Gospel is preached truly and purely there must be a holy Christian Church; whoever doubts this must doubt whether the Gospel is the word of God. But where there is a holy Christian Church, there must also be the sacraments, Christ Himself and the Holy Spirit. Now, if we are a holy Christian Church and possess the greatest and most necessary things, as the divine word, Christ, the Spirit, faith, prayer, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the keys, office, &c., must we not have the least also, namely, the right and power of calling persons to the office, who shall administer the word, Baptism, the Supper, and minister to us? What kind of a Church would this be if we had not such right? What would become of Christ's word: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them?" And again: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." "If two or three have such power, how much more a whole Church." (Luther 131: 374.) So Gerhard writes: "To whom Christ has given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to him belongs the right of calling ministers of the Church. But the keys of the kingdom were given by Christ to the whole Church. Therefore with the whole Church is the right of calling ministers." (Loci, 24: §87.) It is plain that, since Christ has given the keys to His Bride, her consent must be necessary to authorize any person to use her property; and no call can be valid which ignores her just claim.

3. That the Church must give the call is evident further from divine commands which imply this. Only when congregations can choose or refuse ministers is it possible to comply with the divine precepts requiring us to shun false doctrines and false teachers, and cling to those which are true. But such precepts abound in the Bible. "As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. 1: 9. "Beware of false prophets, who come unto you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." Matt. 7: 15. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 Jno. 4: 1. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into

your house, neither bid him God speed ; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." 2 John 10, 11. If the congregation has no power to elect or reject a minister, how shall they guard against ravening wolves and the poison which they disseminate ? It will not be supposed that the numerous admonitions in this regard mean only that each individual is to distinguish the true from the false for himself, and keep silence about it : that he is to reject the error and the errorist in his own mind, but say nothing to any of the brethren. Such charity, which sees the wolf and gives no warning, the Scriptures cannot be charged with inculcating. But if each Christian is bound to reject the false doctrine and the false teacher, and to do this openly, each Christian must necessarily have a voice in the election of the teacher ; for it is a manifest contradiction to say that we must adhere to or reject a teacher, according as he is true or false, and yet that we have no choice. We must express our adherence to or rejection of the proposed pastor either by vote or by separating from the congregation. And it will not be presumed that the ordinary way of expressing the rejection of a false teacher is to leave the congregation. The proper way is to reject the teacher and preserve the congregation entire, if possible. But this cannot be done unless the members are permitted to give expression to their conviction by their vote. In no conceivable way can believers prove all things and beware of false prophets without the power of election, if congregational organizations are to be preserved. Nor will the case be remedied by saying that congregations must indeed preserve the right of election, if the members would discharge their duty of preserving the purity of doctrine according to their ability, but the call is different from such election and is given by a different body from the congregation. We shall come to speak presently of the field, to which one is called and its limits ; for the present it will suffice to observe that if one is a pastor before he is presented as a candidate for a congregation's election, he is not *their* pastor and, if rejected, cannot be : to them he will be to all intents and purposes an uncalled person, as he is in reality so long as no congregation has called him to their pastorate. "Whoever has the duty of discerning teachers from imposters, of proving sound doctrine, of distinguishing the voice of the Great Shepherd from the voice of the false shepherds, of not following but fleeing from strangers, of anathematizing those who preach a different Gospel from that preached by St.

Paul, must also have the duty, in the proper mode and order, of calling the ministers of the Church. But the former is, by divine precept, incumbent on the sheep of Christ, or the hearers. Matt. 7: 15; Jno. 5: 39; 10: 27; Gal. 1: 9; 1 Thes. 5: 19-21; 1 Jno. 4: 1; 2 Jno. 10-11. Therefore the latter must be also. The inference is manifest. For if the hearers must beware of false prophets, they must in due order and form beware lest false teachers be introduced into the ministerial office, and consequently see to it that true and pious teachers are called to this ministry." Gerh. Loc. 24, §88.

4. The Church must have the right of calling the ministers because they are her ministers. This the Scriptures plainly affirm. "Let no man glory in men: for all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours." 1 Cor. 3: 21, 22. The ministers, however great may be their gifts, are not our lords that we should idolatrously cling to them and by our partiality for persons cause schisms in the body; they are ours, not we theirs. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus, the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." 2 Cor. 4: 5. When erring men are driven to the desperate expedient of interpreting this passage as ironical, they furnish the best evidence of its decisiveness. For if it were at all possible to understand it in any other sense than that of making the pastor a servant of the Church, by no means the reverse, these men, in their zeal to subordinate the Church to the ministry, would find some explanation to square with their theory without resorting to the reckless shift of assuming the whole to be irony. One is strongly tempted to suppose, that it sounds quite ironical in the ears of such men for a bishop to declare that he preaches not himself, but Christ Jesus, the Lord. Let men say what they can to support unscriptural theories, the Scripture truth still remains clear, that ministers are the people's servants for Jesus' sake, whom they serve, while they serve His bride. St. Paul, speaking of himself, says: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church: whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you to fulfil the word of God," Col. 1: 24, 25. But if pastors are the ministers of the Church, it must be obvious to all who are willing to see that she

must have the right of choosing her ministers. He who owns the property and whose servant or steward the minister is to be, must assuredly have the power of appointing him. If it should be objected to this, that it places the Church higher than the ministry and consequently degrades the latter, we admit the premise and deny the conclusion. We hold, as our fathers held and expressed it in the Symbols, that in "1 Cor. 3 St. Paul makes all ministers equal, and teaches that the Church is more than the ministers." (330, 11.) But they who suppose themselves degraded by having the Church placed above them, have but carnal notions of Christian dignity and honor. The Master's words and example should have taught them better. "Jesus called them unto Him and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." Matt. 20: 25-28. "In the Church there will be bishops, pastors, preachers and other like official persons; these are to serve alone, and not to assume to themselves external power or glory on account of such office or service, as the Lord's example here shows. 'For whether is greater,' says He, 'he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.' Luke 22: 27. And Jno. 20: 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' Now it is obvious to see that Christ was not sent by His Father to rule like a temporal prince and to seek temporal honors. But he was sent to preach and suffer. So He sends His servants. Therefore those who hold ecclesiastical offices should never permit this image to fade from their eyes and hearts and should beware of the devil, who would lead them to abuse their office for the attainment of personal honor and glory. In the temporal government it must be so; whoever has the office must also have the power. But in the Church 'serve' and suffer is the word, not rule and fare sumptuously. He that will do it, let him do it. He that will not do it, let him not boast that he ministers in the kingdom of Christ." (Luther 6: 380.) But if he is willing to serve, he must acknowledge the right of the Church, whose servant he would be, to call him to her service, and not officiate at the bidding of those

who have no authority to call, in contempt of the flock who has it. For, in the words of Gerhard, "To those, whose ministers the pastors are and are called, must belong the right and power of calling the pastors. But they are and are called ministers of the Church. Therefore to the Church belongs the right and power of calling pastors. The minor proposition is proved by 1 Cor. 3: 21; 2 Cor. 1: 24; 1 Pet. 5: 2, 3." (*Loci*. 24: 89.)

That the Church has the right to call her ministers is thus established beyond controversy. She alone has the priesthood and keys and can alone confer the right of exercising them, as they can be legitimately exercised only by her, whether directly or by her individual members, as in private, or through an agent, as in her public ministrations, when the minister acts in her name in virtue of her call. She is called to guard the purity of the doctrine and ward off false teachers, which can be done only on the ground of her having the power to call in her own hands. And the ministers are asserted to be hers, which of course implies that she has the right to choose them. But there is still another argument to be offered in confirmation of our position, which we deem it necessary to present, not only because it is of great weight in itself and may serve to banish lingering doubts arising from preconceived opinions, and clear away objections, but also because it has been supposed to countenance the opposite view.

5. That the congregation gives the call is proved, finally, by the practice of the Apostles, as recorded in Scripture. The presentation of the argument chiefly in the words of distinguished authors, will subserve the purpose of showing how the Church teaches at the same time that the Scriptural truth is elucidated. "We should not doubt," says Luther, "that the congregation, which has the Gospel, may and should elect and call the person who is to teach the word in its stead. But thou sayest: St. Paul commanded Timothy and Titus to ordain priests, and in Acts 14. 23 we read that Paul and Barnabas consecrated priests in the congregations; therefore the congregation cannot call any person, nor can any one come forward of himself to preach among Christians, but the permission and commission of the bishops, abbots, or other prelates who sit in the apostles' seat, must be obtained. I reply: If our bishops and abbots, &c., sit in the room of the apostles, as they pretend, it would pass as an opinion that they should be permitted to do what Titus, Timothy,

Paul and Barnabas did in the ordination of priests. But since they sit in the devil's room and are wolves who will not teach nor tolerate the Gospel, the appointment of ministers and pastors concerns them as little as it does the Turks and Jews. They should drive asses and lead dogs." (22: 148.) It is a palpable misconception of Luther's meaning to assert that he, in this passage, admitted the ministerial right of appointing ministers, and denied it in the case of the papists, only because they were not faithful ministers. He merely asserts that an arrangement could be made, if they were faithful, by which the ordination would be left to them, as it has been and should be in the Church, not by necessary divine right, but as a matter of propriety and order, not as a matter of faith but, as he expressly asserts, as an opinion. If this were not certain from the words quoted, it certainly would be from those which follow. He proceeds: "Besides, if even they were true bishops who desired the Gospel, and were willing to ordain true preachers, they could not and should not do this without the congregation's consent, election and call, except where necessity requires it, that souls may not perish for the want of the divine word. For in such necessity, as thou hast heard, not only may every one procure a minister, whether through prayer or the power of the civil government, but may also, if able, hasten forward and teach himself. For necessity is necessity and has no measure, just as every one should rush to the rescue when the city is burning, and not wait until he is requested to help. But where there is no such necessity, and where persons are found who have the right and power and grace to teach, no bishop shall ordain any one without the congregation's election, consent and call, but he shall confirm the person elected and called by the congregation. If he refuses to do this, such person is confirmed at any rate by the congregation's call. For neither Titus, nor Timothy, nor Paul ever appointed a priest without being elected and called by the congregation. This is clearly proved from Tit. 1: 7 and 1 Tim. 5: 2: 'A bishop must be blameless,' and from the command to prove the deacons. Now it is not likely that Titus knew who were blameless, but the report must come from the congregation, who must designate them. Again we read in Acts 6, that the Apostles themselves were not at liberty to appoint persons, even to the much less important office of a deacon without the knowledge and consent of the congregation; but the congregation called the seven deacons and the

Apostles confirmed them. If the Apostles could not by their own authority install officers whose duties referred merely to the distribution of temporal things, how could they have been so bold as by their own authority to confer the highest office, that of preaching, upon any one without the congregation's knowledge, consent, and call?" The celebrated Chemnitz exhibits the truth on this subject, in opposition to the errors of the Tridentine Council, as follows: "Here the question occurs, by whose voice and suffrage this election and vocation must be given in order that it may be considered divine, that is, that God may Himself by these means elect, call and send laborers into His harvest? In respect to this there are certain and manifest examples in Holy Scripture. In Acts 1, when another was to be elected in the place of Judas, Peter proposed the matter not only to the Apostles, but also to the other disciples, as the believers were then called, the number of whom assembled was about one hundred and twenty. And there he showed from the Scriptures what persons and how they were to be elected, and in connection with this prayers were offered. Lots were cast, indeed, because the vocation was not to be simply mediate, but Apostolic, on which account they were not to be used subsequently in merely mediate calls. When, according to Acts 6, deacons are to be elected and called, the Apostles are unwilling to arrogate to themselves alone the power of calling, and therefore call the congregation together. But they do not altogether decline all care for the vocation and leave it to the blind and confused arbitrary will of the people or the multitude, but they are as it were the governors and moderators of the election and call; for they propose the doctrine and rule respecting the persons to be chosen and the manner of choosing them. Those who are elected are placed before the Apostles, that the election may be approved by their judgment as to its validity, and they approve the election by the imposition of hands, while prayers are offered. According to Acts 14 Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in the several congregations which they had evangelized. But they do not assume to themselves alone the right and authority to elect and call; for Luke uses the word χειροτονήσαντες, which, in 2 Cor. 8: 19, is employed to designate an election by the voice or suffrage of the congregation; for it is derived from the custom of the Greeks to give their vote by extending the hand, and signifies the designation of any one by vote, or the manifestation of consent to anything. Paul and Barnabas did not, therefore, impose the elders upon the un-

willing congregations without asking their consent. And when, as recorded in Acts 15, men were to be appointed to bear messages to the church at Antioch, Luke says: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas." It is important to observe in the apostolic history that sometimes the ministers and the rest of the church, at the same time, proposed and elected the proper persons jointly, as in Acts 1. Sometimes the congregation proposed and elected, but the election was submitted to the apostles for approbation, as in Acts 6. But frequently the apostles, who were better able to judge of these things, proposed to the congregations the persons whom they judged qualified for the ministry, and when the vote and consent of the congregation was given, the call was valid. Thus Paul sends Timothy, Titus, Sylvanus, &c., to the churches. Thus presbyters are proposed in Acts 14, whom the Church approves by their suffrage. Sometimes persons of their own accord offered their services to the Church, 1 Tim. 3: 'If a man desires the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.' But always in the times of the apostles there was found and required in a legitimate call the consent of the congregation and the judgment and confirmation of the Presbytery. So Titus was left in Crete to lead and direct the election of elders, that it might be properly held, and that he might by ordination approve and confirm the election properly made. For in Titus 1 Paul uses the same word in reference to the appointment of elders which occurs in Acts 14, where mention is made of the election as well as of the ordination of presbyters. And he commands Titus to rebuke those sharply who are not sound in doctrine and do not teach as they should; that is, as he expresses it more clearly in 1 Tim. 5: 'Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins,' namely, by approving an election or vocation which is not properly made." Exam. II, 226. The advocates of the theory which makes the office dependent, not upon the congregation's, but upon the ministers' call, will not find it easy to refute the argument of this celebrated writer from apostolic practice, and it certainly requires no little hardihood on their part to maintain that the leading writers of the Lutheran Church ever countenanced their Romanizing error. The same argument is presented also by Gerhard, who after showing that all orders in the Church must have a voice in the vocation of pastors, which belongs

to the whole Church, not to a mere portion of it, and pointing out what part should be properly assigned to each in giving the call, writes thus: "The general rule, therefore, that pastors are called by the consent of the congregation and that no one is to be imposed upon it against its will, has the express testimony of Scripture and is confirmed by the constant practice of the primitive Church; but the particular form of election varies: for sometimes the votes of the people have been required to nominate persons, sometimes their approbation have been required in cases of persons previously nominated. This is confirmed by the apostolic practice in the election of Matthias, Acts 1: 15; Peter points out what kind of person should be chosen, then v. 23 the congregation appointed two, one of whom, namely, Matthias, when he had been divinely chosen by lot, was elected to the ministry by the common voice of the disciples, v. 26. Although this call of Matthias was an immediate one, yet this suffrage of the believing people, which was added, is rightly applied as an example of mediate vocation. In Acts 6, when deacons were to be appointed, the apostles said to the brethren, that is, the rest of the church: 'Look ye out seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. These then elect Stephen with six others, whom they set before the apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands upon them.' So these deacons were appointed by the vote of the whole Church. According to Acts 14: 23 the apostles ordain elders in their newly organized congregations by collecting the votes *χειροτονήσαντες*. In 1 Cor. 16: 3 we read: 'Whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send.' According to 2 Cor. 8: 19 Titus was chosen of the churches, the congregations approving the choice of Titus by their consent and vote, and approving his person also (*χειροτονήσεις*). In 1 Tim. 3: 7 it is said of a bishop that 'he must have a good report of them which are without,' how much more of them over whom he is placed. Therefore the judgment of the congregation must be heard respecting the person to be elected to the ministry. And St. Paul says 1 Tim. 5: 22: 'Lay hands suddenly on no man,' that is, not before the testimony and consent of the church is added." (Loc. 24: §86.) The record furnished of apostolic practice is thus seen to be so far from presenting a difficulty and forming a ground of objection to the Lutheran doctrine, that it affords strong confirmation of its truth.

But the whole purpose of the present section is not yet accomplished by showing that the power of calling to the ministry belongs to the congregation. We have proved that it does lie there. But the Scriptures teach more than this ; the truths exhibited imply that the power not only lies in the congregation, but that it lies nowhere else. This seems to us of sufficient importance to call special attention to it, as it sometimes appears to be considered a matter of indifference whether the call comes from the Church, or from the State, or from that portion of the Church which is called the ministry.

III. The call to the pastoral office can be legitimately given only by the congregation, as the power of calling belongs exclusively to the church, all whose members have equal rights in this regard. Two theories at variance with this truth have been advocated, the one claiming the right and power for the civil government, the other for the incumbents of the ecclesiastical office, to the exclusion of all other members of the church.

1. That the right belongs to the civil authorities is an assertion so utterly gratuitous that much need not be said to refute it. A Scriptural argument to sustain it does not exist, unless the attempt to prove regulations, intended for circumstances and relations under the old dispensation to be normal for all time, should be dignified with such a name. The whole spirit of the New Testament, as well as all its teachings and examples, are so manifestly inconsistent with such a subjection of the Church to the State, that any endeavor, seriously to establish it from the Gospel, would seem like madness. That Church and State are both divine institutions, that they are mutually to respect and aid each other so far as this may be done within the domain of each, and that men's rights as citizens of the State and as members of the Church are equally to be preserved, according to our Lord's will is undeniably true ; but it is just as certain that the two spheres, and the rights and duties pertaining to each, though both are equally divine, must not be confounded. The Church serves the State by furnishing such power to men and inculcating such principles, as will render them quiet and orderly citizens, who will always be willing to give unto Cæsar that which is Cæsar's ; the State serves the Church by protecting her against the violence of wicked men who, refusing to be directed by the gentle power of the word, which the Church employs, must be coerced by the

rude power of the sword, which God has authorized the State to wield. But neither is subject to the other: they are co-ordinate powers, each with its peculiar mission; and the State can therefore as little appoint the Church's ministers by divine right, as the Church can appoint governors of the State. Either may be done *jure humano*; but neither can be done in virtue of powers, divinely conferred to this end. The State may have an arrangement with the Church by which the latter may nominate the ruler, or consecrate the lawful head of the government: there could be no objection to this on Scriptural grounds, if the arrangement seemed expedient, so long as that, which is freely entered into, is not made compulsory, or represented as essential. It would be the sheerest arrogance for the Church to claim that there could be no legitimate ruler without her voice or benediction. So the Church may have an arrangement with the State by which the latter may be authorized to nominate or appoint pastors. There could be no valid objection to this either, so long as the arrangement were deemed a matter of expediency, into which the parties have voluntarily entered. The Church would thus be merely acting by proxy: the rights which she enjoys would be exercised for her and of course by her consent, by the civil authorities, which of themselves have no power whatever in this respect, and which would be guilty of a most mischievous usurpation, if they presumed to exercise such power in their own name and compelled the Church's submission to it. By such delegated right the power of calling ministers was freely accorded to civil rulers by the Lutheran Church, at various periods in her history; and this fact has often been misinterpreted as though it subordinated the Church to the State. It was a mere expression of her unvarying doctrine, that the Church alone has the priesthood and keys and can therefore alone appoint the ministers to use them; but she is free to make this appointment in the manner which suits her best, whether by the vote of her entire membership, or by the vote of a vestry, or committee, or person, in whom she has vested the right. The words of Luther conclusively prove this, even if such interpretation of the fact were not rendered absolutely necessary by the principles expressed, apart from any direct statement as to how the Church understood it. He says, as we have already quoted the words on p. 14, that pastors are called by the congregation, or by those who have the congregation's com-

mand and consent to do it. This command and consent the civil powers frequently received in Lutheran countries, being called to act in the Church's name. Then the rulers sometimes acted, without any expressed consent, as principal members of the churches, by a kind of necessity, owing to the incompetency of the people, amid the papal darkness, to use their privileges. Thus Hartmann says: "In our days the distinguished piety of our princes is worthy of praise, inasmuch as they appoint capable and worthy teachers for their subjects, not that the congregations might be deprived of their rights; but because the people neither understood nor exercised their right, and their judgment was clouded by ancient errors, the rulers took them under their guardianship and acted instead of the Church." Past. 76, (as quoted by Walther, &c. 314.) Whatever may be said of the rights of the state in things sacred, it is certain that according to the Lutheran doctrine the consent of the congregation, even though sometimes, in cases of necessity, it should be mere silent consent, was always, and must always be, deemed necessary for the appointment of pastors, because believers, not civil rulers as such, alone have the keys. If theories have been broached and laws been enacted which are inconsistent with this, it must be apparent to those who have carefully considered the subject and examined the evidence, that they are just as little Lutheran as they are scriptural.

2. The other theory, that the ministry is an order which propagates itself, and that accordingly ministers are called to the office not by the Church, but by those who themselves hold the office, has not only more advocates, but has also more semblance of reason for it. But it is equally false, and can be proved to be so on scriptural grounds with equal certainty. For that all Christians are one in Christ and have, therefore, an equal share in the believers' privileges, that they all belong to the Lord's body and have equal share in the treasures which the Lord has been pleased to confer upon His bride, that they all possess the priesthood and the keys in common, has been proved from the Lord's infallible word. This in itself clearly evinces that every attempt to prove a doctrine which is inconsistent with these equal rights must be a failure. But the proofs adduced bear their weakness on their face. They would be inconclusive in any case; they are little less than an insult to the understanding when it is seen that they are brought forward to subvert precious Chris-

tian privileges which are divinely guaranteed. Thus it is argued that, because Jesus sent His disciples as He was sent Himself, they must necessarily have the power of calling others to the office as He had it. But the Scriptures nowhere affirm that the ministers become equal with Christ because He has called them to a holy office; It is almost blasphemous to base equality with Christ, in all things upon the similarity of commission to preach the gospel between Him and His apostles. But if equality in all things is not intended to be maintained, by what right is equal power in commissioning ministers claimed? The question is, in what respect is their commission like Christ's? and the proof is positive that it is *not* in respect to the right of commissioning others again. Further, the argument has been harped upon from the days of Bellarmine down to the present, until it has seemed as though it were the only one in which the advocates of this hierarchical system had themselves any confidence, that it contravenes all equity and propriety to maintain the authority of the sheep to elect their own shepherd. That the members of the congregation are called sheep, the congregation a flock, the ministers pastors, we all know. But it provokes a smile when strong men forthwith conclude that ministers must alone have the power of appointing ministers, because sheep cannot be presumed to have discernment enough to make choice of a shepherd. Now, this is all very well when we are speaking of literal sheep: they manifestly have not the rational powers necessary to select a proper shepherd over themselves: such shepherd must be appointed by those who are of the same species with him, namely, by human beings. But it is an insult of the greatest magnitude to say that Christians are all mere irrational brutes, with the exception of the ministers, and can therefore not be expected to have sense enough to make choice of a pastor, whose appointment must be left to those of the same species with himself. And yet this is precisely what the argument implies; it is of no force whatever, unless this be admitted. For if we assume that the shepherd is himself one of the flock, what objection can there then be to his being chosen by his peers? If there is an utter impropriety in the appointment of the shepherds by the sheep, how could the ministers themselves make the appointment, if they themselves are sheep of the Lord's fold also? The whole argumentation is preposterous. The flock is not one of brutes, but of rational creatures, whose wants the Lord

supplies, and who is, in this respect, called their shepherd : In His name others are chosen to administer the means of His appointment and thus bear to His people the spiritual food which He prepares, and these persons are, in this respect, called the shepherds. Now, if there is any inconsistency or impropriety in maintaining the right of the people to select one from their own number to administer this office, seeing they all have the same dignity and the same character as Christians, it must require a special revelation to see it. The impropriety is precisely the same as it is in the case of an appointment to any office by an election, that is, it has no existence at all. Finally, when an argument is drawn from the practice of the apostles to prove the divine right of the ministry to appoint ministers, we need only refer to what has been said on this point above to prove its fallaciousness. It is false in its assumption of facts and its inferences from them. The facts in the case are that the apostles ordained men to the ministry, who were designated for the office and called by the congregation's vote, as this is conclusively proved in the extracts from Chemnitz and Gerhard. And if even the facts were otherwise, if even it could be shown conclusively that the apostles did send forth ministers without the consent or call of the congregations, it would not follow from this, that the power of appointing the pastors is lodged not in the people but in the pastors themselves. For it must be observed, in the first place, that the whole world was then missionary ground, and that missionaries, whose business it is to plant churches, not to be pastors of already collected flocks, need no other call than that which they have as believers and lovers of souls, which entitles them all to speak about Christ to the heathen around them. If, then, the apostles did send out preachers to evangelize cities and provinces, they did just what any pastor may do just as well, according to the Lutheran faith as according to the Romish theory, nay, they did just what any layman may do ; and the persons thus sent had just the same rights where there were no existing congregations as they would have had, if sent by laymen, or if they had gone without any other commission than that which all have from the Lord in faith and charity. And it must be observed also, in the second place, that the relation of the apostles to the existing congregations was different from that of pastors in established churches. Their field was the world ; there were no parochial limits, within which their vocation was to be exercised. The diffu-

sion of Christianity throughout the world, not merely the preservation and edification of churches previously founded, being the object of their mission, their activity could not be limited to a narrow field, as is that of ordinary pastors. If, then, they did send persons to minister to congregations which they had gathered, they did only what Lutheran pastors may do now, without in the least conflicting with the Lutheran doctrine, as we have presented it. They sent vicars to act as their substitutes, in their own field and upon their responsibility, just as a pastor may have another to officiate for him in his own congregation, he bearing the responsibility, although this could not be long continued without the congregation's consent. But such a wide range ministers have not now; the world is not every pastor's field, but only that portion of it to which he is called, and in that limited parish he has just the same authority as the apostles in theirs, deducting that which grows out of the infallibility of these inspired men. If such exceptional cases of apostolic appointment to pastoral duties did occur, they do not, therefore, conflict with the rule that the congregation gives the call; nothing more than a fair consideration of the extraordinary times and circumstances, in which the apostles lived and, labored would be necessary to show the consistency of such cases with its requirements. Such are the arguments which are brought forward to prove the ministry to be an independent, self-propagating order, in opposition to the doctrine of our Church which affirms it to be appointed by the Church. A score of such could not create the slightest presumption against a truth as plain as this, that the priesthood and keys belong to the Church, and must therefore be administered by her authority, especially as this conclusion is confirmed by numerous precepts and examples of the Scriptures. The arrogance of ministers and ministerial bodies therefore deserves nothing but condemnation, when they usurp all power and authority in this respect, as is frequently done, we grieve to say, even by those who love to bear the Lutheran name. In many instances the congregations are not even allowed the right of veto, much less that of election. True, in most cases they are permitted to vote upon the question whether this or that person shall be their pastor; they can elect him or reject him, so far as their particular, parish is concerned. But ministers often without asking any congregation whether they want him, and even in spite of their declaration that they do not want him, ordain a person, and

make him and themselves ridiculous by styling him a pastor, even if nobody wants him. The congregation's veto is not admitted to have any force in regard to the ministerial call, but only, at best, in regard to the right of exercising the ministry, already received in any particular locality. People can quietly endure such gross wrong, only while they are kept in ignorance of their rights; where they are conscious of their Christian prerogatives they must indignantly protest against such usurpation, as we do here. Not that the call is to be given altogether independently of ministers and Ministeriums. Christian men who contend for Christian rights, will be least inclined to trample on the rights of the ministers, whose rights and privileges are of course not less than those of any other Christian. Where a parish has already a minister and desires to call another, it would be just as sinful to do so without hearing the voice of the pastor, as it is for a Ministerium to make pastors without people. And in any case it is proper for the congregation to procure the assistance of ministers, if this is possible, in the appointment of pastors; first, because they usually are best able to conduct the examination with regard to the candidate's qualifications; secondly, because the reverence which is due to God's ambassadors to men requires this; and thirdly, because it is meet that the public ceremonies which are proper on such occasions should be conducted by those who already hold the office. So the appointment of ministers may be delegated to a Ministerium or Synod by the congregation recognizing it, and may thus be attended to in their name, just as such authority may be given to the civil government, and precisely in the same way. No wrong could be found in such an arrangement, freely entered into for the sake of expediency. But when a body to which rights were delegated, to be used in the name of their proprietors, usurped them as their own and deny the owner's title to them, it is very questionable expediency to entrust them longer in such hands. An outrage is then committed which faith alone cannot endure. In any case the power can be in their hands only by consent of the congregation to which it originally belongs: the proof of this from the Scriptures and the Symbols has been abundantly furnished: and the call is thus given through the congregation, whether the power of conferring it is used mediately or immediately.

§3. *The Call is given by a particular parish and is confined to its limits.*

The notion that a minister is such absolutely, whether he has a parish or not, and that he accordingly has peculiar powers, which no other person has, beyond as well as within the limits of his parish, if he happens to have any, finds not the slightest encouragement among Lutheran writers of note, as it has not the slightest foundation in Scripture. The doctrine taught by the Bible and by the Church is, that the pastor's peculiar calling extends no further than the congregation which has called him, and beyond this he has no more rights than any other Christian. This we proceed to prove.

1. That the call is limited to the parish, extending the call, is evident from the nature of the ministry. The pastor is not a lord over the flock, but an agent of the people of God. Where there is no church there can, in the nature of the case, be no pastor; for, although there may be a missionary purposing and laboring to gather a flock, yet he cannot possibly do this as a minister of the congregation, which does not yet exist, or of the people of God who are yet to come into being. Whatever ceremonies may be performed by way of sending missionaries to places in which congregations of Christians have not yet been formed, and whatever names may be applied to the persons thus sent, it remains an undeniable fact that among the unbelievers they are not pastors, but simply Christians, and do whatever they can to evangelize the people in virtue of their royal priesthood, not in virtue of any peculiar powers which they possess above other Christians. There is not the shadow of a proof that not every Christian, ordained or not, has a perfect right to make as many disciples as he can among the heathen. On heathen ground there can in reality be no distinction between pastor and people, for the very simple reason that a Christian people does not exist there. But it may be answered that a person can be appointed pastor in general, to whom a particular flock may be subsequently assigned. We see the same congruity in this as in the appointment of any other officer, who has no place and no power to exercise the office. It is ridiculous to speak of appointing a President or Governor who has nothing, over which to preside or govern. One may be found qualified for a Presidency and designated and recommended for the office, but he will remain a candidate for it, not an actual president, until he is chosen by the proper authorities; and the proper authorities are the people to be governed, not the assembly of Presidents or Governors

already existing, unless these are requested to do it in the name of the people who have the power. So the recommendation of a person to the pastoral office by persons who are qualified to judge, and his designation and benediction, if persons see fit to give this in such cases amid public ceremonies, can present him as a proper candidate for the pastoral office, but cannot render him a pastor, which requires the election of those, whose pastor he would be. A king without a country and a pastor without a congregation are among the absurdities, in which people will sometimes fall. Upon no other ground than the popish one, that the ministry is not a mere office, but an order of superior holiness, the members of which are made recipients of some indescribable something by the sacrament of ordination, which impresses an indelible character on them, can any rational claim be built of a ministry without a parish; for only upon such ground can a man be a minister, even though not an individual, much less a congregation, should desire any ministrations at his hands. But a congregation cannot appoint ministers for another congregation: each has the right of electing its own. If the congregation extends a call to a person, it of course means that the call is confined to that congregation, and no sane person understands it otherwise. If the call comes from a Synod, or committee, or Ministerium, it comes on behalf of some congregation for whom such body is agent, and then the recipient of the call is again aware of his special field, and thinks of no other; or the call is of no force and validity whatever, giving no rights and conferring no privileges. Or what rights and privileges are conferred? Where does a person receive a right to officiate? Where there is no congregation? There all have the same rights without a call. Where there is a congregation? There he has no rights whatever, until he receives a call. The congregation's call gives him, who previously had a right to officiate nowhere publicly in the church, a right to officiate within its limits as their pastor, and, as one congregation cannot be lord over another, it gives him a right nowhere else. If he legitimately performs pastoral functions anywhere else publicly in the church, it must be after being called by the congregation, or being requested by the duly called pastor to officiate as his vicar in his name and stead. No other theory could be brought into harmony with the words of our Symbols, "That God has given the keys not to several particular persons, but to the whole Church," and that "the Church is

above her ministers;" for if a person could be pastor independently of the congregation or congregations, he must necessarily be in possession of the keys without receiving them from the church, and it would then not be true that God gave them not to particular persons, but to the whole church; and if the keys belong to the persons whom no church has called, but whom some members of the church are pleased to denominate pastors, so that the congregation is rather dependent on the ministry, than this on the congregation, for the use of the keys, it would follow that the ministers are superior to their churches rather than, as the Confessions affirm, that the church is superior to her ministers. The steward's rights and duties are confined to the house, of which he has been appointed steward, and extends not to those, the stewardship of which has been given to others.

2. That the pastor's office is limited to his parish is evident also from passages of Scripture bearing more directly on the question. St. Paul says: "So have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." Rom. 15: 20. This gives a reason for such limitation. The work to be done requires economy of powers. Where one is laboring, another must not exercise his gifts and energies, unless there is need for more than one. There are places enough where labor is necessary; we must not squander it in places where it is unnecessary. Besides, when we labor in a place pre-occupied by another we not only needlessly waste strength, but we at the same time encroach upon another's domain. What the apostle was constrained to guard against, namely, building on another man's foundation, we have the same, if not greater, reason for shunning. The same apostle, in opposition to the false apostles who gloried in themselves and reaped where they had never sown, declares in another place: "We are come as far as to you also in preaching the Gospel of Christ: not boasting of things without our measure, that is, of other men's labors; but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you, according to our rule abundantly, to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand." 2 Cor. 10: 14-16. Now, if they, who had a so much more extensive call than we, whose field was the world, as no minister's is now, deemed it wrong for themselves to labor in fields which others had been culti-

vating before, and thus appropriate to themselves honor which belongs to others, how deeply sinful should it not appear in our sight, if careless men should presume to break into parishes to which they are not called, and to do this especially in spite of another's protests, who is called! But if a person who has received a regular call from one place is thus earnestly prohibited from officiating in the bounds of another, just as much so as the person who has no vocation to the office, the call must, of course, confine the office to the congregation by which it was given. The person who has no such call to a particular parish has not the office; the person who has the office has a parish. This is evinced by the examples, presented in the sacred records. All the ministers of whom we there read, except the Apostles and those who were employed by them as vicars, were ministers of special congregations, not of the whole Church in general. That the Apostles were not limited to any particular place we grant; it was one of the peculiarities of their office, as distinguished from the ordinary ministry, that they had the world for their field. We therefore do not deny that they were a kind of universal bishops and general superintendants as well as preachers of the gospel in the ordinary sense. The unlimited field of labor was extraordinary in the apostolate, and as such is not to be predicated of the ordinary ministry. We have no Apostles now; least of all, would we suppose those who have no parishes to be such, even if we admitted that the particular office with all its powers remained. But it did not so remain. The Apostles were the first ministers, and as such their office, which is the ordinary ministry, has continued until this day and will continue to the end. The administration of the means of grace for the saving of souls was their great work, as it is that of the ministry always. In addition to this they had prerogatives belonging to them as extraordinary ministers. They were inspired and, therefore, infallible in doctrine; they were endowed with the power of working miracles; and, as already stated, had an unbounded field of labor. But in the latter, as in the two other respects, the ordinary ministers differ from them. And the example of the successors of the Apostles, rather than of these themselves, must be deemed normal for us, for the plain reason that our ministers are not Apostles, but their successors. Now, the examples recorded of such ordinary teachers after the Apostles show that each had his proper parish and definite place assigned him, being

called and limited to that. Thus it is said Acts 14, 23: "When they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord." It has been shown, that the word translated "ordained" means to appoint by vote. These elders were elected in the churches under the supervision of the Apostles: they were regularly called by the congregations, whose ministers they were to be. Each one had his charge; each church had its minister. The words cannot be fairly interpreted to mean anything else: every church had its elder. This is confirmed by Acts 20, 28: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." The pastor has his flock to attend to: for this he is to render an account; among them he has solemn duties to perform and precious privileges to exercise; but beyond this fold he has neither the right to officiate nor the responsibility to sustain. When a man is a minister he necessarily has a flock to lead and consequent rights and responsibilities; the minister is a minister not of the whole world, nor of all the churches in the world, but of the Church which has called him to the office. And when people speak of one's being a minister, even though he have no flock, we cannot but insist that they must either suppose the minister to be made the subject of some ineffable something, which elevates him personally above other christians, though he exercise no ministerial functions whatever and have, in fact, no right to do so, seeing he has no vocation, or they must confound the qualifications for the office which may have been found in a person, with the office itself, being guilty of the same absurdity as those who, having found in a person the requisite qualities to make a good ruler, declare him to be a Mayor to whom nothing is wanting but a city: a Mayor in general, until he is called to some particular city by the people's vote.

3. Of such errors and incongruities our fathers were never guilty. They taught the limitation of pastoral functions to the parish by which the call was given, and knew of no office or right to officiate, apart from such call. We shall give some extracts from writers of the highest authority in the Church to establish this, as evidence that the scriptural doctrine which we have exhibited is the Lutheran doctrine also. Dr. Luther speaks thus upon the subject: "If Münzer, Carlstadt and company had not been permitted to sneak and

creep into other's houses and parishes, whither nobody sent them and for which they had no commission, all this great trouble would have been averted. That the apostles also went to other's houses and preached, is true; they were commanded to do so, and were appointed, called and sent to preach the Gospel everywhere, as Christ said: Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; but afterwards no one received such common apostolical command; on the contrary, every bishop or pastor has his particular district or parish, which St. Peter therefore calls *κλήρος*, that is, portion, because to each one is assigned his portion of people, as St Paul also says to Titus." (39, 254.) This doctrine, which is here so deliberately expressed, is often presented incidentally in his writings, as no other would be at all in harmony with his doctrine of the ministerial office. He also speaks of the distinction between the priesthood which belongs to all Christians, and the pastorate, which only those have who are called, and makes use of this expression: "In addition to this that he is a Christian and priest he must have an office and an appointed parish." The special parish is thus represented as essential to the minister: "It is one of the requisites to distinguish a paster from a common priest, i. e. believer. So again, in a letter to Dorothea Joerger, he says: "Whoever is called is consecrated, and shall speak to those who called him: this is the consecration of our Lord God, and is the true chrism." (55, 105.) In Luther's view the call from those, whose minister a person is to be, is necessary, and nothing beyond this, however great might be the utility of other things, usually connected with the appointment of ministers, as ordination, &c. With this the expressed convictions of others of the most celebrated writers in the church coincide. Chemnitz writes: "What we have above said concerning the vocations of the apostles, that it extended itself over the whole earth, we are not able to affirm of those who are mediately called. For doctors, pastors, bishops, presbyters are called to certain congregations, and have not absolute power to teach everywhere or in all churches. So according to Acts 14, 22 elders are appointed in every church, and in Tit. 1, 5 we are informed that Titus was left in Crete, that he might ordain elders in every city. And thus the Lord is accustomed to show each one, by a special vocation, where He desires him to use his gifts; and this vocation gives no authority to teach in other congregations which have given no call. Hence in the coun-

cil of Chalcedon, (held A. D. 451) it was determined that no one should be absolutely ordained, that is, not until he is called to a certain and special congregation." (Loc. P. III, p. 136-7.) And Gerhard says substantially the same in various places. "The ministry of the apostles," he remarks was not limited to a certain place, but to them the command and authority was given of preaching everywhere. Matt. 28, 19; Mark 16, 15. But the ministry of those who succeeded and now succeed the apostles in the office of teaching, is confined to a certain place. Acts 14, 23 presbyters are ordained in every city; Acts 20, 28 the ministers of the Ephesian Church are said to be constituted bishops of a certain flock by the Holy Spirit; Tit. 1, 5 Titus was left in Crete to ordain elders in every city; and 1 Pet. 5, 2 it is said: "Feed the flock of God which is among you; that is, the flock which is committed to your care and fidelity." (Loc. 24, §220.) According to these authorities there can be no universal bishops now, such as the apostles were, but only ministers of congregations; and the pretended appointment of men to the office, who have no call to a parish, is an idle ceremony, which gives them not a particle of power or authority. A valid call, which renders a man a pastor, renders him the pastor of those, by whom he is called, and of no others.

§4. *The call is not given for a definite period, but is unlimited in regard to time.*

The limitations which the scriptures affix to the pastoral office in regard to place are not applicable in regard to time. The pastor has his particular parish, but he has no limited time, during which he is to officiate. The office is conferred without any reference to time; its duration will be determined by circumstances. A call for a stated period would ill accord with the nature and the objects of the office. To prove this, and to point out the legitimate consequence of it, is the desire of the present section.

I. It might be supposed, that there is no necessity for the presentation of evidence to establish our proposition, as few, if any, deny it, especially as it is not easy, and usually not required, to prove a negative. But evident as the truth stated appears in itself, and general as may be the assent to it in theory, it is still frequently denied in practice, which indicates, that it is not fully admitted in all its consequences. but it should be, because

1. The Scriptures teach that the office is conferred for an

indefinite time, as it prescribes no limits in precept or in example. All the ministers, of whom mention is made, were so permanently. The ministry everywhere meets us as a vocation for life. Not only do we not read of any who were appointed for a limited time, but we do read of a number who continued their ministerial labors until death, and the legitimate inference is, that they were appointed to the office during life or for an unlimited time. And the language which is used in scripture in reference to the officers of the Church frequently implies the permanence of their appointment. For example, St. Peter addresses the elders thus: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Pet, 5, 2-4. This manifestly pre-supposes that they should retain their office and be faithful in the discharge of its duties while they live, or until the crown of glory should be given them in heaven. Again, St. Paul says to Timothy: "Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." The apostle remained a laborer in the ministry until his departure, and Timothy is also by implication exhorted to labor faithfully until death, making full proof of the ministry. Of the elders and bishops who were ordinary pastors in particular congregations, there is no account given from which we could learn how long they remained in their office; but in the absence of direct proof the presumption of their permanence, furnished by the cases of ministerial service during life which we have, must be sufficient to convince all reasonable persons. And this especially when it is considered that,

2. Reason teaches that the call should not be limited in time. For, in a matter so momentous, it is scarcely to be expected that congregations will be so reckless as to act before they are convinced of the candidate's qualifications. But if they are convinced of this, there is no reason why the appointment should not be made absolutely as regards time, since there certainly is no limit, beyond which a pastor's services will not be necessary; on the other hand there is rea-

son for desiring their indefinite continuance. For experience only increases the qualifications for the ministry and supplies the skill to render it more successful. The first years of a faithful minister's labors are usually those in which least has been accomplished, although appearances would sometimes indicate the reverse. The more extensive the knowledge acquired in process of time, and the experience gained in the life within and without, as well as the increased ability to use successfully the treasures acquired, generally render the pastor more able. In view of this it would be a mistaken policy to choose the minister only for a limited time, and leave him, after the expiration of this, to assume his place again among the hearers. And it would not be rendered much better if the design were to re-appoint him at the end of his term in case he continued acceptable. Indeed, it is a question, whether this does not make the matter worse. For, in the first place, it is the expression of some lingering doubt or suspicion as to the pastor's fitness for the office; and the election without confidence can only be pronounced sinful; or it is the manifestation of that wanton spirit which desires a preacher merely for excitement and amusement, not for the means of grace unto salvation, and which, therefore, seeks to be free from any obligation to retain a pastor longer than he can satisfy their carnal requirements. And, in the second place, if even a pure motive could exist, the arrangement would prove injurious to congregations on account of the opportunity presented of giving vent to those prejudices which will always exist, and the influence of which at elections tends to disturb the church's harmony. It is, therefore, wrong to give calls to the ministry for a limited time. It does not, indeed, render the call itself invalid; but it is, so directly against all scriptural usage and enlightened reason, and so generally based on sinful ground, that a congregation could rarely give, or a minister accept such a call without sin. That the call may terminate before death, is readily admitted. For

II. The legitimate consequence of our doctrine is not that the call is absolutely for life and cannot, under any circumstances, cease to be of binding force, but it is, that the call cannot usually expire by previous limitation, and must, therefore, be abrogated, if at all, on grounds which were not seen to exist at the time it was given.

1. The call is not of such a character that it cannot be revoked or abrogated under any circumstances. This would be a necessary consequence, if it were maintained that it is given absolutely for life. But such is not the case. There is no limit fixed, at the time it is extended; but this does not prevent its limitation by Providence or man's folly. Divine Providence may render a severance of the pastoral relation desirable, by a visitation which disables the minister, but which does not incapacitate him for some other pursuit; and under such circumstances it is evident that the resignation of the office is a plain duty, that the former pastor may engage without encumbrance in some other employment. The call has then no more binding force than if had never been given. Human folly may also be instrumental in terminating the call, and this in a two-fold manner: first, by misleading the pastor, and secondly, by misleading the people. The pastor is required to be sound in faith and blameless in morals. The call is given upon evidence furnished, that the candidate has these qualifications in addition to the necessary physical and intellectual powers; that is, the call is so given where the Scriptures are followed. But the called person may become unsound in the faith, or immoral in his life, or may even have been so previously, and concealed the sin. In either case the call terminates, not of course by limitation to a specific time, but by a breach of essential conditions, and the congregation, which would comply with the divine word, must revoke it immediately. On the other hand the congregation may become, or prove to be one whose minister the called person cannot conscientiously be. The people may refuse to endure sound doctrine, and, in spite of all their pastor's warnings and entreaties, adopt a false Confession. He would have no other choice, in such a wretched case, but to shake the dust from his feet and depart thence. But while the call may be terminated by circumstances, and is thus not necessarily obligatory for life,

2. It is a legitimate consequence of our proposition, that the pastoral relation cannot be arbitrarily severed, at any time, by either party. Excepting in those cases in which the one is bound to reject and condemn the other for false doctrine or life, and therefore to revoke or resign the call, mutual consent is required to abrogate it. The pastor has no right to depart from his people whenever his fancy prompts him, and just as little has the congregation a right to depose and dismiss him according to their whim. The

vocation to perform solemn duties cannot be cast off so easily ; it may be man's pleasure to flee from the awful responsibility rather than to labor and pray, trusting in the grace of God for ability to bear it, and be faithful ; but man's flight cannot compel God's permission, as it does not necessarily pre-suppose it. The vocation, though it came through the congregation, is divine ; and a divine call, especially to an office so important, cannot be nullified by a human notion. If we would be released from it, we must ask release from Him who gave it, and seek it through precisely the same channel through which it was given. The congregation calls in the Lord's name ; if circumstances come, in which the call should be revoked, the congregation must revoke it in the Lord's name. There may be occasions on which a pastor, who finds no cause which necessitates the relinquishment of his present field, may desire to be released from his obligations to the congregation. Nor need this desire be in conflict with his duty. Another charge may have called him to take upon himself the duties of the office there. There may be cogent reasons for his being convinced that the change would be an advantage to the Church : that it would be a gain for at least one of the congregations, if not for both. But this conviction by no means abrogates the call, which his present charge has given him. If it is God's will that the change should be made, there is no necessity for a departure from God's order to make it ; the congregation which extended the call will be made willing to take it back when, under such circumstances, it again is resigned into their hands. Ministers sometimes deceive themselves by assuming it to be the divine will, that they should accede to this or that vocation. The call which they have is binding first of all, and from the obligations which it imposes they must be released first, before they are free to accept any other ; and it is safest to abide by the decision of the brethren in reference to a second call, even apart from the imperative duty of compliance with the requirements of the call, previously given, until released by the party giving it. It is amazing with what levity ministers sometimes treat their vocation and with what facility some will sever the relation which God has formed. It is not a rare thing that they practically treat a new call as divine, but the old one, under which they had thus far labored, as merely human ; for they feel bound by the new, but not by the old. We cannot conceive how any

new call can be supposed to be binding as long as the former one remains in force ; and in force of course it remains, not only until it is resigned into the hands of those who gave it, but also until these have accepted such resignation. When this is done the minister is released from all obligations ; the divine order is satisfied ; and human right is observed. The conscience is at peace, and the pastor enters upon his new field with a light heart, not burdened by the fear that he may have fled from God when he changed his location, or that he may be performing duties in one place which, by a previous call, he owes to another. But just as the fact that the call is given for an indefinite time requires, that the minister must not, while he can conscientiously remain, change his present relations without the consent of those who called him, so it requires, on the other hand, that the congregation should make no change in their relation to the pastor, without his consent. They have given him a call, and they are bound to comply with its stipulations as well as he who is called. And just as the departure of a minister without further notice, or the submission of his resignation to the people for their acceptance, does not release the minister from his obligations to the flock, unless they accept the resignation laid before them, so the deporal of the pastor by the congregation and the election of another without further notice, or the submission to him of a request or demand to return the call, does not release the congregation from any obligations imposed on them by the terms of such vocation, unless he complies with their request and returns it. They may depose him for false doctrine or immoral conduct, and the call is annulled by this act ; so the minister may reject them for their unscriptural Confession in word or practice, and the call is again abrogated. But they cannot depose him, nor he condemn or reject them without scriptural grounds, and still justly claim their acts to be legitimate.

It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the call cannot be limited by anybody aside from the congregation whence it emanates, as it cannot be, by the congregation itself. This truth is often practically controverted. There are persons of ability, nay, whole Synods which claim the right, and practice it, of limiting calls, which the congregations have left unlimited. A flock calls a pastor, exercising a right which God has given and which man cannot destroy. The *Ministerium*, with which the flock is in some way connected through its pastor, approves the call and gives its benediction. But the newly

called pastor is seen to be a young man, or, if not young, is at least inexperienced in the ministry, or is supposed to be. Therefore the *Ministerium*, usurping rights which cannot have been conferred in such a case by their proprietors, because these have already acted in the premises and acted differently, resolves to sanction the call, with a limitation to one year. It is not of importance for our present purpose to show that there is no good reason for this, as it is reckless to approve the vocation of one whose qualifications are doubtful, and unjust to withhold approbation if they are not so; that it is a contradiction to speak of a candidate for the office who already has the office, and is licensed to administer it even by those who call him a candidate; that if a distinction is made between pastors of unlimited and those of limited calls, such distinction is unwarranted according to the doctrine of ministerial parity, always held by our Church, and cannot fail to be injurious; but this we would have carefully observed, that if a *Ministerium* limits a call, given by a charge, it not only does that which we have proved to be wrong in itself, but it does so under circumstances, which render it intolerable. For it not only virtually denies the people's right to call, but it refuses even to accord to them the permission as a matter of courtesy, inasmuch as the call given is revised and materially changed by limiting it in time, and rendered unscriptural beside. The adherence to the scriptural rule of permanence in the ministry, while it will guard against the abuses, to which reference has been made, will secure for ministerial labors the greatest possible success by affording the greatest possible advantages.

ARTICLE II.

THE OBJECT OF LIFE.*

By THOMAS H. STOCKTON, D. D., Philadelphia.

WHAT is the object of life? I answer—to do good. By the promptness and positiveness of this reply, I desire to intimate the certainty and exclusiveness of its truth. In

*Many of our readers will recognize, in the following article, the Address, delivered by the author before the Literary Societies of Pennsylvania College, at the Annual Commencement, Sept. 19th, 1844.

the assertion of such truth, neither doubt nor reservation can be tolerated a moment. As surely as life has an object, that object is, to do good. The subject admits but two theories: one, of Selfishness—the other, of Benevolence. In all essentials, these are opposite and hostile. It is impossible to reconcile them. The difference between them is as great, and as incapable of reduction, as that between a point and infinity. Persons may change; but principles cannot. The concord of Christ and Belial might be imagined, if it could not be believed; but even imagination cannot harmonize truth and error. The restoration of peace between God and the Devil might be supposed, however improper it would be to entertain such a supposition; but good and evil, which are modifications of the same terms, must be utterly abandoned to unavoidable and external separateness and conflict.

The two theories may be thus generally and briefly contrasted: that of selfishness is natural—that of Benevolence, supernatural; the former, a matter of reason—the latter, of revelation; the former false—the latter, true; the former, infidel—the latter faithful; the former, demoniac—the latter, Divine; the former, destructive—the latter redeeming; the former is reprobate, and doomed to oblivion—but the latter is elect, and predestinated to the glory and ecstasy of universal and perpetual triumph and praise.

But let us submit them, successively, to special consideration:

I. THE THEORY OF SELFISHNESS.

What is the theory of Selfishness? Its cardinal and controlling doctrine is this: that Life, in its nature and relations, is now, just as it seems, all it ever was, or will be. This is a great principle; comprehensive as the globe, and varied and minute as its inhabitants and interests. From this doctrine proceeds, immediately and efficiently, this distinguishing precept: that it becomes every man to make the most of life, just as he finds it, according to his own will and pleasure, irrespectively of his neighbor's welfare in this world, or his own in any other.

Now, what is Life—according to this theory? I tell you, in advance, it is something which I am happy to despise. Rather, were the theory true, or could I believe it true, life is something I should be proud to despise. Hitherto, I have had no use for this haughty phrase. As a matter of taste,

and of duty, I have shunned it longer than I can remember. It is not a fit word for a Christian. But here, though even here only hypothetically, I am at liberty to use it. And I avail myself of this liberty with a keen gladness; for, there is no other word which could half so well express the lofty scorn I pour through the sentiment—if life were no more than this theory assumes, I would be proud to despise it. To understand the assumption, we must contemplate man himself and the sphere in which he dwells.

Preliminary to this exercise, however, it is well to remark, that the two great doctrinal and practical characteristics of the theory, as already presented, cannot be stated, without the obvious implication of an undesirable condition of things—something, in life and its connexions—something, in the acknowledged necessity to make an effort to derive from it whatever enjoyment its circumstances will allow—not as we would have it, if we held the power to change it. The theory does not assert perfection, of either nature or relation; does not enjoin the pursuit of absolute felicity; but merely teaches, that our present estate, however imperfect, is all we can expect, and, therefore, as, among its many sorrows, some joys may be found, that it is our first and last duty to seek and secure them.

There are two other discriminations, which it is of the utmost importance to premise. They are verbal, yet substantial and thorough; determining the course and form of the whole investigation.

The first, relates to the difference between constitution and condition. By the term constitution, whether applied to a person or thing, I include all the particulars which are essential to its perfect existence. By condition, I embrace all the non-essential circumstances and influences, in which the constitution may be variously involved, and by which its manifestations may be modified, but which cannot destroy its inherent faculties. The human constitution is one thing; its condition, another. The constitution of the earth is one thing; its condition, another. The constitution never changes; the condition is always changing. The constitution of the earth may be regarded as settled; but history and prophecy assure us, that the contingencies of its condition comprehend the deluge and the conflagration—the silent dreariness of a lifeless desert, and the smooth and glowing paradise, blushing with the modesty of universal beauty, and pulsating with the sympathies of universal love. The con-

stitution of man must be regarded as fixed ; but the alternatives of his condition ascend to the sublimest heaven and plunge to the profoundest hell.

The second, relates to the difference between the ideal and the real. By the ideal, as applied to a person or thing, I mean, the mental contemplation of its constitutional perfections and conditional felicities. By the real, I mean the actual constitutional and conditional development ; whether perfect and felicitous, or, imperfect and sorrowful. The ideal man is one thing ; the real, another. The ideal earth is one thing ; the real, another. In both cases, the ideal is perfect ; the real, imperfect. The ideal, as perfect, is one ; but the real, as imperfect, is manifold. Some men seem to be nearly perfect ; and others, mere conglomerations of all imperfection. Some parts of the earth may be described as heavenly ; while others are parched and desolate as perdition. So various are the degrees of imperfection—the diversities of the real. Not that it is necessary the ideal and real should thus differ—but, that they do differ.

These preliminaries arranged, we may now glance at the nature and relations of humanity, that so we may rightly respond to the inquiry—What is life, according to the theory of Selfishness ?

First, Man, himself—what is he ?

What is our physical constitution ? What is the ideal of it ? It is a wonderful ideal. It is more than the mere artist could make it. It is more than the mere anatomist, or physiologist, could make it. And yet, like theirs, only blending their advantages, it is composed of the choicest facts of observation, the most careful deductions of philosophy, and the fairest embellishments of fancy. So far as this world is concerned, it certainly presents an incomparable instrumentality. For the combination of complexity and simplicity in structure ; for separate, concentrate, and honorable variety of uses ; for symmetry of outline ; for delicacy of investiture ; for beauty of complexion ; for meaning of countenance ; for dignity of port ; for grace of motion ; for everything tending to the consummation of unapproachable superiority—there is no such physical organism in any department of nature which is open to our inspection.

But, what is our condition in this respect ? How does the real compare with the ideal ? If we select some noble specimen, as illustrative of their occasional similarity—such a specimen, for instance, as the flatterers of the imperial al-

ways celebrated, as distinctive of Nicholas, the late Russian Autocrat—what have we, but a splendid subject for multiplied and destructive experiments? What though it teems with the most exquisite susceptibilities, myriadly sympathetic to every influence from within and without? What though a ripe grape cannot be pressed upon the lip, nor a breeze blow, nor a flower be shaken, nor a bird sing, nor a star shine, nothing, however slight or remote, make its gentle appeal to its appropriate sense, without exciting the quick thrill of grateful pleasure? Is it not equally responsive to every element and motion of pain? Is there a point, in its whole extension, where some fine nerve is not exposed to sudden and sharp distress? May not violence find revenge—wherever it strikes? And what thousand-eyed vigilance is sure guard against the onsets of accident? Is there a muscle that may not be torn?—a bone, that may not be broken? Is the eye or hand, the brain or heart, a moment safe? Disease—may it not be inhaled with the breath, taken with the food, contracted by a touch? And does it not search the whole form? Does it not try every fibre? Does it not congest, obstruct, inflame, consume? What scalpel of the anatomist can equal its subtle dissections? How soon, by such causes, may that same perfect specimen, as it is so vainly styled, be thrown into a delirium of agony, in which even the faintest remembrance of ease shall be as impossible as its sweetest and fullest enjoyment!

But, if I thus speak of the seemingly perfect, what shall be said of the imperfect! Shall I call up their defective, distorted, debilitated, and ghastly varieties? I cannot. Shall I expatiate on the difference between the cripple who looks from his threshold, and the hunter who climbs the mountain? between the ear which is entranced by the softest sigh of love, and that which takes no note of the nearest and loudest thunder?—between the tongue which has pregathered the stillness of the sepulchre, and that which is ever vocal with the music and eloquence of all that life has taught it?—or, between the eye which sees not the edge of the precipice but a step before it, and that which reads the star-hymens, written by the fingers of Omnipotence on the farthest walls of the temple of immensity? Shall I dilate on the contrast of the crooked and imbecile to the straight and strong; or of the fulness, force, and flush of maturing health, to the long languor of thin and glazed consumption? Let us dismiss such contemplations. The truth is vivid enough, and im-

pressive enough, without them. And this truth, so simply suggested, is, that whatever is admirable in our physical constitution is counterbalanced by something deplorable in its condition—and that its realities are sadly at variance with its idealities.

What, then, is our mental constitution? What is its ideal? It is more wonderful. No one class of the professors of mental science can fairly and fully unfold it. It is more than phrenology, or metaphysics, or transcendentalism would make it. It consists of the eclectic verities of all natural and spiritual systems—the harmony of all styles and accomplishments of thought—an ideal of which it might be said, that it glitters with all the regalia of genius, and lavishes, with royal munificence, on all its realm, the amplest treasures of learning; were it not, that it is above royalty, too pure for vestments, too beautiful for jewelry, and too rich in its distributions to be compared with the expenditure of an empire, or the wealth of a world. How shall we contemplate such an agency? Is not knowledge its only object? Does it not relate to the endless acquirement and wisest employment of knowledge? And are not its adaptations, in both connexions, and its attainments and achievements by them, the vaunting and idolatry of every land and age?

But what is condition? What the degree and vigor of its development? What the position and circumstances in which it is placed?

Generally speaking, the degree of development is very low. In the great majority of our race, there seems to be no consciousness of the highest intellectual powers. In others, there is a partial disclosure of nearly all. In others, the full exhibition of some one noble faculty creates distinction. In others, a similar exhibition of several of the selectest faculties gives pre-eminent distinction. But, in how few do we witness the glorious unveiling of a complete mental orb! And, in cases where something of this kind does appear, how feeble is the manifestation in comparison with its expected vigor! How often is it more like the full moon, than the full sun—the pale and powerless reflection instead of the glowing and fruitful radiation. But, when we meet, as if in a very angel, the revelation of all mental energies in one person, and every energy in its utmost intensity—still, what difficulties remain, because of his position and circumstances! Let even these be as propitious as the loftiest and most richly provided of earthly elevations can

supply—still, what disadvantage lingers which no earthly facility can escape ! In a word, what can earth teach him ? With countless assurances of ability to comprehend all knowledge, what is there for him to learn ? On the theory we are now considering, which necessarily excludes inspired instruction, I again demand, what can he learn ? And I answer—nothing, which, under such circumstances, is worth the learning. Whether, therefore, we regard the condition of the few or of the many, it cannot be made correspondent with the intimations of the constitution—the real is miserably meagre, in comparison with the ideal.

What, then, is our moral constitution ? What, its ideal ? It is most wonderful. The graduation rises from instrument to agent, and from agent to principal. The principality is here. The sovereignty is here. If the object of each of the other departments of our nature may be declared by one word, so may the object of this. If it be the object of the physical, to act ; and the mental, to know ; so it is of the moral, to love. To live—is to love, know, and act. What then, could furnish a fairer ideal than this ? All principles, sentiments, affections, emotions, inclinations, sympathies, passions, impulses—all the promptings, directing, determining and sustaining powers,—united, in the pure, sweet, gentle, generous, joyful influence and dominion of love—a spirit that is as dignified as it is amiable, as mighty as it is meek, as majestic as it is simple, taking hold on all that is great and all that is little, humbling the exalted, exalting the humble, and reconciling all extremes of interest in equal and common good.

But how does the condition compare with the constitution ? In many cases, I gladly acknowledge, the comparison is delightful—though, in such, it is not hard to perceive, even though the fact be not confessed, the refinements of a celestial visitation. The fountain of my own tears is oftenest unsealed by the soft and sudden finger-touch of the seraph of moral beauty. The heart instantly melts in the vision of this loveliness. But ask the most blameless moralist, if his self-examined and conscious character match his moral ideal ? And you must hear a painful answer—painful, because of its want of candor, or, its exposure of evil. But, the millions you need not ask. Hatred, for love ; foulness, for holiness ; passion, for principle ; lust, for affection ; anger, for meekness ; petulance, for patience ; remorse, instead of peace ;

and fear, instead of hope—these, and such as these, are the sad substitutions every where seen. Policy, expediency, interest, may throw many restraints around them; but the realization of the true ideal is scarcely ever dreamed of, and if it were, at best it could be but a dream.

Still glancing, quickly, from point to point, let me add to this statement of man's nature, something similar respecting his relations. These are social and natural.

The social relations are three—domestic, civil, and religious.

The domestic constitution is beautiful. It is the ideal of all we mean by a happy home. And there is nothing on earth so attractive. A good marriage, and a well-blended progeny; connubial congeniality; parental and filial interchange of intelligence and affection; brotherly and sisterly attentions; protected, respected, and grateful service; out-going charity; ingathered hospitality; industry, order, neatness, quiet, peace, plenty, comfort—a house-full of all comfort!—that seems as near my meaning as anything I can say. Let him whose experience teaches him the meaning, exult in the real and perfect the ideal.

I hasten to the inquiry—how does its condition compare with its constitution? That there are instances which approach correspondence, has been already sufficiently intimated. To these may be added others, which, notwithstanding occasional perplexities and jarrings, are yet generally pleasant. But, of how many more, must it be said, that their condition is as ugly as their constitution is beautiful! The relations subsisting—husband and wife, parents and children, brothers and sisters, master and man, mistress and maid, host and guest—some, or all, of these relations, and their obligations, in full force; and yet—indolence, insubordination, confusion, noise, vexation, discomfort—a house-full of discomfort—destructive, almost, of their daily estate! And where such evils are not displayed, how frequently ignorance, affliction, and poverty prevent the realization of a happy home!

But, turn to the civil constitution. This is a noble ideal. The union of persons and families in one great state—with its common government; its defended interests—agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial; its arts and sciences; its literature and philosophy; all the elements and forms of national dignity, prosperity, and power—uniting successive

generations in the execution of the same measures ; perpetuating conventional agreements and institutions until their very antiquity makes them venerable and hallowed ; and girding, by their fame and by their agents, the ends of the earth—surely this is a noble contemplation. Whether a patriarchate, a chieftainship, a monarchy, an aristocracy, a republic, or a democracy—the general notions of union, improvement, safety and glory, involved to a greater or less extent in them all, cannot but challenge admiring regard.

But, what is to be said of its condition ? If it be, as alleged, that "power is always stealing from the many to the few," and that, once in possession by the few, "its tremendous tendency is to accumulation," can it also be said, that the few always exercise it, as they ought, for the good of the many ? Is there an incorruptible government on earth ? Nay—is there a government not already corrupt ? Is there a State, not oppressed ? Is there not a nation, not imposed upon, outraged, and abused, by its own proper guardians and guides ? Where does the real image the ideal ? Nowhere !

Turn, then, to the religious constitution. What shall I say of this ? It is a magnificent ideal—a grand, a glorious, an infinitely vast and splendid ideal. No epithets can be turgid here. Yet, on the theory which governs these thoughts, for the present, and which rejects the only true religion—there is nothing so mean and contemptible. For, it is an ideal of fiction, of superstition, of fanaticism, a fantastical ideal, suggested by some vague and timid craving. Even christianity may be, and it is to be feared sometimes is, subordinated to this ideal ; and, instead of being rejected, as it ought to be, if not true, is, like other systems, at once received and disbelieved.

What, then, is the condition of religion ? Worse than bad—inexpressibly wretched. Nothing appears, or can appear, on this scheme, at all comparable to the true notion. It is a matter of state-craft, of church hypocrisy, of personal pretence, of universal dissimulation and self-seeking—the instrument of extortion, robbery assassination, massacre and war ; of all kinds and degrees of abominations.

So much for the social relations. Now, look at the natural. By these, I mean the connexion of man with the general system of the earth and the universe.

What, then, is this constitution ? Or, the ideal—in this connexion ? It is exceedingly extended and picturesque.

An ideal world, adapted to the ideal man—large enough for the common and commodious occupancy of a population of innumerable millions—composed of elements, harmless in all their combinations, useful in all their products, and so distributed as to minister to every want and anticipate every desire. A world, filling every sense with inexhaustible freshness of enjoyment—perfuming without faintness every breath; regaling the taste with no fear of ill by the varied flavor of all food; entertaining the ear, without a note of discord, with the melodies and harmonies of all music; and opening to the eye, without a single offensive contrast, all visions of beauty and rapture—the ever-changing panorama of the seasons, with the green spring, yellow summer, and the purple autumn, always rejoicing in the vales; and the white winter always, if not only, frosting the loftiest summits above them, cooling the down-flowing waters, and the up-blowing winds, and imaging to the pure below the still greater purity of the regions to which they point:—these, and, with these, the daily, simple, ample, matchless glory of sunrise, noon, and sunset; the near, mighty love-match of the fair and gentle moon; the far-off gaze of the timid and tremulous stars; the brief but glad pause of the pale-returning comet, hovering in the midst of sister-spheres so long unseen; and a thousand humbler and more familiar meteor angels, shooting their rockets through the dust of the evening, hanging their showery and seven-hued bows on the cliffs of the morning, and oft, through the serene expanse of invisible mist, diffusing the earliest or latest sunbeams, from east to west, or from west to east, in all the open heaven, until the cities and villages of common pomp and peace; the gardens, orchards, meadows, and grain-fields of the unblighted Edens around them; the rivers, lakes, and safe-rolling seas, among or beyond them; and the mid-way terraces of the moss-hung and cedar-shaded mountains—with their icy pinnacles ever seeming to rise higher and shine brighter; all kindle, and glow, and burn, like forms and motions of gold and fire, in full reflection of the glorious firmament above them. A world, not only thus teeming with comfort, and forever inspiring the imagination with the sentiments of poetry and art, but calling the intellect to the sublimer task of mastering its internal symbols and their significations; comprehending its planetary connexions and dependencies; and deducing from outward grandeur, variety, and loveliness, the laws of all science, and the principles of all philosophy!

But, what is the condition of this constitution? How does the real compare with the ideal, in this case? Little, if any, better, than in the others. One broad inscription of imperfection reaches from pole to pole. The hostilities of the lower animals, among themselves, and toward mankind; the inequalities, in respect of natural blessings, in human society; deserts of ice and fire; vast wildernesses; dangerous waters; volcanoes; earthquakes; tempests; famines; plagues; and the causes of all ordinary, but most afflictive and destructive diseases and accidents—are evidences here. There is no rational way of treating these things but as conditional imperfections. Ever spinning on its axis, and ever bowling round the sun, on, and on, and still on, rolls the world, bearing indisputable testimony to the universe, that the most enlarged and enchanting ideal may be encompassed by the real in all-penetrating and all-subduing evil.

Such is life—on this theory! This is its nature, and these are its relations.

What now? Can we believe that such as life thus seems, it is all it ever was?—that the physical condition of our race never better corresponded with its constitutional ideal than it does now?—that its mental, never did?—that its moral, never did?—that its social relations were never designed to be better illustrated?—that its natural relations were never more benignant and blissful? Can we believe, that in all these respects, life never will be more than it seems?—that there is no good hope of thorough, substantial, and permanent improvement?

And, thus receiving the doctrine of the theory, shall we therefore, in deliberate selfishness, set ourselves to the work of fulfilling its precept? Shall we devote ourselves to the task of making the most of such a life, according to our own will and pleasure, irrespectively of our neighbor's welfare in this world, or our own in any other? Shall we? I prolong the inquiry. Hope gone, despair come, selfishness triumphant—say—shall we abandon ourselves to this motive?

If so, what can be made of such a life? What can the infirm, the ignorant, the immoral make of it? What can the members of a wretched family, the subjects of an oppressive government, the slaves of a cruel religion, make of it? What can the dwellers of venomous, dreary, sickly countries, make of it? Nay, what can the most fortunate, in these respects, make of it? Any thing worth the effort?

What has been made of it? Even this theory has a history—of several thousand years. Let the scroll be brought forth. Let it be unbound. Let it be unrolled. Let it be read, distinctly and loudly, that all may hear. I grant you, it is an impressive record. Pleasure has been made of life—such as would stir the young blood, to tell. And wealth, and power and fame have been made of it—such as would stir the old blood, to tell. Ask!—what has been made of it? See the palaces and domains, which have been illumined by a thousand festivals? See how the treasures of empire have been gathered and lavished as personal possessions? See how sceptres have been seized, crowns won, and thrones secured! See how the renown of ages has been anticipated by the acclamations of a day! Ask, rather, what has not been made of it?

But I am not, and cannot be, so satisfied. This is the blazonry of the few. I ask for the many. What have they made of life? You tell me of the architect—I ask for the builders. You tell me of the planter—I ask for the laborers. You tell me of the hero—I ask for the host. You tell me of the monarch—I ask for the subjects. The millions—for them I inquire. What have they made of it? Pain and poverty, slavery and contempt, tears, and toil, and blood!

And so rises, the chief inquiry! For how long did the few make so much of life—and the many, so little? Let death answer! Hitherto, his pale visage has been excluded. Now, let him in. See!—how the ghastly tyrant smiles! Hark!—with what cruel coldness he speaks of having swept into the grave innumerable generations! All physical varieties—the fairest and the most infirm; all mental varieties—the most stolid ignorance and the most brilliant erudition; all moral varieties—the purest and the foulest. All relative interests—husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant; the prince and the peasant, the philosopher and the idiot, the orator and the mute, the artist and the clown, the priest and his dupe, the rover of the desert and the denizen of the city—all have been swept, ay—swept into the grave—swept with the refuse of all things—swept as a nuisance from the presence of their proud and perishing survivors—swept quickly—half of them in childhood, millions on millions, just as youth grew lovely and the world attractive, other millions in the midst of the plans of mature life, and others, in the marvellous dotage of a premature and speedy

decay—too feeble to totter to the close of even four-score years. O, how often, in writing and speaking, pen and tongue labor to express the inexpressible! How they labor here! How the indefinable awe, the thunder-smitten wonder, the astounded and quivering consciousness prompt the vain wish for some word of electric opening—of flashing and vivid disclosure of his unexperienced mystery! How calmly it should be whispered—how wildly it should be shrieked—if it could only be commanded!—that one word of infinite mockery, wherewith to answer the question—what has been made of life? For want of such a word, all I can say is—it has been remanded to its origin. Like the marsh-meteor, it has fallen whence it sprang. Its course has been from darkness to darkness. It has been reduced to nothingness. On this theory, it is nothing. A hundred times as many of our race as are now breathing, generations that thronged and shook the world, on this theory, are now nothing. And we can expect no other fate. So “let us eat, drink, and be merry—for, to-morrow we die!”

Is not such a life despicable? Who could do else than despise it? Only let me be assured that such is life, and—I repeat my first avowal—I will be proud to despise it.

Surely the whole contemplation implies something better. Let us, therefore, consider the better system:

II. THE THEORY OF BENEVOLENCE.

What is the theory of benevolence? Its distinguishing doctrine—in contrast to the theory of selfishness, is—that life, as it seems, is not all it is, much less all it ever was and will be: that it is infinitely more noble than it appears, and has been displayed, and is to be again, in personal and relative grandeur, in immediate affiliation to the Deity, and immortal communion with his nature and works. From this doctrinal distinction, proceeds the great practical principle—that, in the intermediate and humbled condition of our race, the object of life must be to do good, by seeking redemption from this lapsed estate, and the restoration of ourselves and others to the proper felicities of our nature and relations.

What, then, is life—according to this theory? This, at least, may be answered—there is nothing in it to despise. Rather, the whole view of it, is ineffably glorious.

Remembering that this is the supernatural theory; received, in faith, as a true and redeeming revelation from God: the fact that its disclosures vastly transcend the perceptions of sense; and, that miracles of majesty, glory, beauty, and bliss come in to relieve and magnify the littleness and darkness of nature, cannot be a matter of reasonable objection to it. On the contrary, such peculiarities would be anticipated.

This theory is a sort of noon-tide demonstration. The evidence of its heavenly origin is found in the unearthly universality and intensity of its brightness. I invite you, therefore, now to a contemplative exercise. The sphere of life revolves in this splendor, as in a radiance not its own; and, without pausing to philosophise on its source, or the mode of its transmission, I yield myself rather to the simple observation of the scenes it successively unfolds.

Here, is no implication of imperfection. The most desolate regions that turn upon our vision, have the promise of perfection; and others, the unblighted or renovated, show it.

Here, the widest disagreement between our constitution and condition is shown to be controllable, even in current cases; while, as respects the past and future, the difference entirely disappears—and our whole being is developed in the triune fulness of its god-like glory, and the correspondent blessedness of its boundless and imperishable estate.

Here, the ideal and real are seen to be twin-sisters—so much alike, that even their Divine Father can scarcely tell one from the other. I see them, on their diamond thrones—of equal pomp and power. Each one wears, in the frontlet of her golden crown, the star of wisdom. Each one is clasped, at the centre of her purple girdle, by the star of love. Each one carries, on the head of her sceptre, the star of omnipotence. These symbols of their sire, are their own. And lo! with what excellency of simplicity, their graceful forms are folded in their flowing robes! With what ever-changing light, as in the summer evening's cloud, the electric energies of their pinions play among their rustling plumes! And with what surpassing beauty, the smile of the highest rests upon the blushing loveliness of their uplifted and adoring countenances! But, see! a sudden change! The throne of the real grows dark as granite. She descends from it; assumes a dull disguise; wraps herself in manifold sackcloth;

scarcely shows, in her penitent garb, the slightest intimation of dignity or grace; sighs—weeps—mourns—seems ready to perish. But the ideal changes not. She stoops, indeed, from her throne, but its radiance illumines her path. She forsakes not her sister. She stops, or moves, with her—and is forever at her side. But she throws no sackcloth over her adornings, and draws no veil over the fairness and sweetness of her face. Rather, she assumes a more winning art; keeps ever before her sister the image of her own proper condition, and the hope of renewed attractions when the days of her humiliation are over. And so, ere long, another change occurs. God cannot endure this difference between His darling daughters. He breathes into the heart of the mourner the living music of pardon and peace. He bids her rise, and, as she rises, the sackcloth's sudden and open net-work of white and shrivelling cords shows that the lightning of the infolded plumes has touched it, and, soon as shown, the last shred vanishes forever! And there she stands, in all her first glory, beauty, and bliss! And God himself is again at a loss to distinguish the real from the ideal. Arm in arm, the sister-seraphs glide through creation, charming the circling spheres with melodies richer than their own—until, returning towards their thrones, the diamond splendors again flash through that granite gloom, and blending with the radiance of the throne by its side, heighten the coming pomp of their glittering stars and sandals.

Now, therefore, let us review the human constitution and estate, that so we may answer the inquiry—what is life, according to the theory of benevolence?

Man, himself, what is he? Let history, observation, and prophecy reply.

This theory has a noble history—not a miserable compend of defective views, erroneous reflections, and wild imaginings; modified by the foolish traditions of the past, and revised and perverted by the partisan interests of the present, but, an inspired history; a history dictated to elect amanuenses, by Him who made the world, and has governed all its changes. What does this history say?

What does it say, in respect to our physical constitution? By an impressive gradation, of the varieties of the real, it identifies the true ideal, suggests, illustrates, and

insures perfection. I allude to instances of longevity, translation, creation, and resurrection.

That this history reveals a degree of longevity, of which there is no other authentic comparable record, will not be denied. That this revelation, in these as in other particulars, is to be received just as we find it, will scarcely be questioned. It is so harmonious with the entire system of creation and redemption, that it would seem as well to reject any other part of it as this.

Some of the post-diluvian patriarchs attained to great age. Jacob, who was a hundred and forty-seven years old when he died, stood before Pharaoh, when a hundred and thirty, and spoke most plaintively of the brevity of his life, in comparison with that of his ancestors. "And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, the days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers, in the days of their pilgrimage." It may not be impracticable to find a person of a hundred and thirty years, in our own day; but it would be very strange to see such a one standing up with the promise of seventeen years more sparkling in his eyes, and stranger still, to hear him complain that the evils of his life had made his days so few, and so far short of the days of his fathers. Isaac died at 180. Abraham, at 175. So, ascending from son to father, from Abraham to the flood, we find these ages: Terah, 205; Nahor, 148; Serug, 230; Reu, 239; Peleg, 239; Eber, 464; Salah, 433; Arphaxad, 438; Shem, 600; and so we reach Noah, who lived in the Old World 600 years, and in the New, 350, in all 950.

Of the ante-diluvians, Enoch, whose stay was shortest of those whose ages are recorded, spent 365 years in this world, before God took him to the better. Lamech, who died earliest of the rest, was 777. Only one of the others, Mahaleel, is below 900, and he died at 895. The remainder, range from 905 to 969, the united ages of the nine, from Adam to Lamech, being 7,625, long enough, if they had lived in such succession, to have allowed each one of them to spend more than 200 years with his predecessor, and the whole nine thus personally and intimately acquainted, to have occupied the world from its creation until now.

It must be remembered, that all these ages are registered in the same book, by the same historian, under the Divine direction, the book of Genesis, or the Generation, prepared

for the very purpose of supplying a history of the world, not otherwise accessible; embracing a range, from the beginning, of more than two thousand years; and embodying events, and with them principles of utmost importance to the interests of our race, and the honor of the Divine administration: a history, which, though it has been more violently assailed than any other extant, has come forth from every dark and furious besieging, as the sun comes forth from the storm, without a flicker, to show that the wind swept it; without a smoke-wreath, to show that the lightning struck it; and without a shadow, to show that the cloud covered it; as calm, smooth, and bright as ever, in its untouched and untouchable sublimity, and as gloriously benignant as ever in its boundless benefactions!

That we may be more impressed by these instances of longevity, as bearing on our subject, let us imagine a few illustrations, connecting, as briefly as possible, the past with the present. If Abraham had lived as long as Methuselah, he might have counselled Joseph during the years of famine; encouraged the Israelites through their centuries of bondage; assisted Moses in the work of their deliverance; soothed them by his patience in the sorrows of the wilderness; accompanied Joshua into the promised land; instructed the Judges in their successive administrations; and stood by the side of Samuel, when he anointed Saul, as the first king of Israel.

If Moses had lived so long, he might have passed on from that anointing, and witnessed the fall of the giant, by the Shepherd-boy's sling; have stood by the throne of David, heard his harp, and united in his Psalms; participated, with Solomon, in the solemnities of the dedication of the temple, and seen the glory of the Lord come down, as of old, into the Holy of Holies; witnessed the separation of the tribes, in the reign of Rehoboam; survived the reigns of fourteen succeeding kings of Judah, and eighteen kings of Israel; been present, at the triumph of Elijah on Carmel, and lingered behind him when he ascended in the chariot of fire; cheered Elisha; congratulated Josiah; been enchanted with the seraph eloquence of Isaiah, Amos, and Hosea; wept, at the plaint of Jeremiah; and died in the midst of interchanging desecrations and reformations, captivities and returns, unrelieved, but by the multiplying and gladdening indications of the coming Messiah.

If Samuel had lived so long, he would have witnessed the destruction of the first temple, and Jerusalem with it; the carrying away of the people to Babylon, their seventy years stay there, and then their return; the rebuilding of the temple and city; and the re-establishment of the pure worship of God. The four major and twelve minor prophets, might all have blown their silver trumpets in his hearing. He would have known the completion of the Old Testament; might have gone out with Jaddua, the high priest, to meet Alexander the Great; seen that boasted son of Jupiter Ammon, worshiping in the temple of Jehovah; learned the founding of Alexandria, and the colonizing of Jews there; beheld his country included in the partitioning of the conquests of Alexander among his successors; and, after watching the progress of the Septuagint translation, have laid down his life within two centuries of the advent of our Redeemer.

If Elijah had lived so long, he might have heard the song of the angels; looked, with the shepherds, on the Son of God; assisted in the ministry of John; waited on the ministry of Christ; and ascended with his Master to the skies.

If Isaiah had lived so long, he might have stood by the cross, and seen the "wounds" which were received "for our transgressions;" stood by the tomb, and seen the Son of God "prolong his days;" stood in the midst of the Pentecostal tongues of fire, reminding him of the time when his own lips were touched by the live coal from the altar, and there beheld "the pleasure of the Lord," prospering in the hands of the glorified Saviour. He might have contemplated the whole ministry of the apostles; the final overthrow of the Jewish temple, city, and polity; the dispersion of the chosen nation, for the last time, and for so long a time, over all the earth; the coming of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God, to "sit down," as His children, "with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," in the true succession of faith; and the full breaking of that "latter day glory," which he so vividly foretold.

If Paul had lived so long—he might have witnessed the reigns of more than 60 Roman emperors; the division into the eastern and western empires; the succession of some 50 emperors of the east, and some 25 of the west; and the establishment of the kingdoms of Italy, Spain, France, and England—surviving Charlemagne, Alfred the Great, and many of their successors. Or, to come down by another line, he would have passed through the ten persecutions, and seen the enthronement of Christianity, by Constantine. He might

have attended seven general councils; witnessed the rise of almost innumerable heresies; the consummation of the development of the man of sin; the succession of more than 100 popes, or bishops, of Rome; and some 16 archbishops of Canterbury; the fearful unfolding of Mohammedanism, in the fairest fields of his own first labors; and the very midnight of the dark ages, resting, heavy and almost rayless, on all the christian world.

Leaving Scriptural examples, a moment, for the sake of reaching the present, if the "venerable Bede," who according to the previous supposition, might have dictated the last sentence of his translation of John to Paul himself, had lived so long, he might have seen the separation of the Greek church; the crusades; and the inquisition; might have commenced with Wiclif, Huss, and Luther; attended the councils of Constance, Trent, and others; looked in upon the Synod of Dort; and almost gained the Westminster assembly, while Wiclif, the harbinger of the Reformation, had he been favored with such a lease of life, would be with us now, with nearly half his term unexpired.

The use that I make of the longevity of the patriarchs, is this: it necessarily suggests the idea of greater physical perfection than is enjoyed at present. There was nothing miraculous in it. Rather, it required a miracle, or, a succession of miracles, afterward, to arrest the tendency. The constitution was so enduring, simply because of its natural vigor, certainly implying the most admirable organization and action.

But, allusion was made to intimations of perfection, afforded by instances of translation, creation and resurrection, as well as longevity. As few words must suffice here.

In connexion with our present knowledge of the atmosphere, and the computations of astronomical distances, the notion of translation is, perhaps, generally regarded, as one of the most wonderful disclosures of our holy religion. Yet, it is no more so than that of creation, or resurrection, or even the fact of extraordinary longevity. Probably, it is as generally a matter of incredulity, that a man should live nearly a thousand years in this world; as that he should ascend to the moon, or the sun, or any other world. Besides, it is to be remembered, that the earlier revelation is illustrated by the later, in this, as in other particulars; and, that an instantaneous change is implied, to fit the subject for such removal. The chief cases are those of Enoch and Elijah. Doubtless the

same change which is to be wrought on all the living, at the last day, was experienced by them. "In the twinkling of an eye," they were perfected; and, being perfected, they were translated, that they "should not see death."

The examples of creation and resurrection, are, of course, those of the first and second Adam, or, the earthly man and the heavenly man. As respects the former, there can be no doubt of his primitive perfection. As respects the latter, if he were not physically perfect before his crucifixion, which, however, there are many reasons for supposing he was; there can be no doubt that he became so, at, or soon after, his resurrection. The first, moreover, is an example of intended immortality; the second of actual immortality. In the former case, the intention was broken; in the latter, it could not be. Physically, Adam died, and remains dead; but "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." The first case, shows us perfection in the beginning of the world; the second, in a late age, and, indeed, even at the present moment: for, while the relics of the "earthly man" are mingled with the elements which were cursed for his transgression, the person of the "heavenly" glows amidst the glory of the close throne of God. To describe it, minutely, is impossible; but somewhat of its character may be gleaned from the circumstances both of its humiliation and exaltation. Living without food, walking on the water, rising to the sky; these are intimations of an instrumentality entirely submissive to the will of the spirit. Outshining the sun, as in the arrest of Saul; and causing John, who had rested his head on his bosom in Jerusalem, to fall at his feet as dead in Patmos, even because of his shaded splendor; these are intimations of an infinitely refined and radiant existence. And so, as by the merest hints, we come to the historic ideal of perfect and imperishable beauty! If the design in respect to the first Adam had been realized, the lungs that were expanded, by the breath of God in Eden, might have been breathing yet. As it is, the second Adam, already nearly twice the age of Methuselah, still lives, with abundant assurance that he will live, forever. And the fulfilment of prophecy may be prelearned from the promise, "Because I live, ye shall live, also."

But, I cannot forsake the range of history, without a few remarks in relation to our mental and moral constitution, ac-

cording to this theory. It is plain enough, that life is not now, all it ever was, in respect to the body; and it may be made equally plain, that neither is it all it ever was, in respect of the soul.

What, then, is the testimony of this history, in relation to our mental constitution? Here, again, the case of Adam is instructive. You remember a token of his incomparable qualifications to originate natural science. The Lord brought unto him "every beast of the field and every fowl of the air," "to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." And so the foundations of zoology and ornithology were laid in Paradise. To my mind, this record is intended to suggest a constitutional capacity for observation and reflection; a comprehensive discrimination of recognition; a certainty of classification and nomenclature, in respect of all natural objects, never witnessed since. Another of his manifest distinctions, was, the faculty of free, familiar, intelligible communion with his Maker, by which means, without any intermediate agency, all knowledge and wisdom would have remained accessible forever.

Coming down, through all the ages subsequent to the fall, to the time of the apostles, we find, in all the history of the church, patriarchal, levitical, and christian, indications of the ideal grandeur of our mental constitution, seen no where else. The chief distinction to which I now refer, the crown and glory of all, is inspiration. That it is a distinction, instead of a common enjoyment, is an incident of imperfection. Compare the original condition of the inspired, with their ultimate estate and attainments. Historians, as they became, never equalled in the world; lawgivers, poets, philosophers, orators, prophets, universal linguists, and workers of all miracles. If such acquirements and uses of knowledge were never known, before or since; if, in all the 39 books of the Old Testament, and the 27 of the New, or, the 66, of the whole Bible, it is utterly impossible to find proof of intellectual incompetency, if there be no diversion from the purpose; no lowering of dignity; no lessening of energy; no intrusion of incongruity; if, on the contrary, there be in it, such a collection of illustrations of mental sufficiency as can no where else be found, such simplicity of narrative, such majesty of law, such ecstasy of poetry, such purity of philosophy, such truthful and glorious eloquence, such certain and far-reaching prophecy, such instant understanding and modu-

lation of unknown tongues, as the utmost opulence of uninspired genius would be exhausted, in a moment, to match in a single particular, let it be remembered, notwithstanding, that all this is merely a slight intimation of our proper mental action. For, if the mind, in its present condition of partial development, be so admirably responsive to the impulse of its Creator, what would it be, if the perfection of its constitution were fully unfolded? If the harp, some of whose strings are broken, and others hanging loose, may yet be taught to breathe such notes of rapture; Oh! if He who made it, and who declared that the enthroned Psalmist was "a man after his own heart," should retune it, as His own "glory," to the delicacy of His own ear, and then, upraising it on His footstool, should straighten Himself on His throne, and waken, with His own unerring fingers, all its harmonies, how would the universe stand entranced, charmed to the stillness of the void from which at first it came!

Yet, there is One, who needs no redemption. I mean, the Redeemer, "the man, Christ Jesus," "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Contemplate the perfection of his intellect, and learn, that life, as now it seems, is not, in this respect either, all it ever was. But, what is the testimony of this history, in relation to our moral constitution? It is yet more full and satisfactory. It is both a natural and spiritual disclosure. Adam, again, is the example of the first; being created "in the image of God." Pre-eminently was that a holy creation. True, its glory was soon darkened. But, from that day to the present, what has been the purpose of God, but to make men holy? What greater fact is there, in all the annals of time, than this, that the Church has always existed, from the beginning until now? There have been intervals, in which there was no State. But there never was one, in which there was no Church. And what is the design of the Church, but, to make men holy? It is this distinctive attribute, that has always made the true Church, "a peculiar people." Others have enjoyed physical good. Others have been endued with genius, and endowed with learning, sufficient to win all the plaudits of fame. But this richer moral possession, this *oâsean* Paradise in the waste of a world's wickedness, has been their own, exclusive inheritance. In this spirit, they have lived, and moved, and had their being. I need not announce them. It is enough to say, that the record of their names, and principles, and deeds, and sufferings, and triumphs, is the noblest record in

the world. Life has been as different from what it seems, to the selfish, as is heaven from hell. In myriads of instances, the change in the moral nature has been so great; the revolution so complete and decisive; the improvement so gracious and glorious, that the ideal has nearly found its counterpart in the real. We can easily understand that the oldest of men might have lived longer; that the greatest genius might have been still greater; and the most accomplished scholar, more erudite, but, it is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine more disinterested benevolence than has been a thousand times demonstrated. Men, naturally even as others, but suddenly inspired with wisdom and virtue from heaven, have given up, for still superior interests, family and friends, home and country, property, reputation, liberty, and life! Could they have done more? Only Bible phrases can describe such changes. To be thus redeemed, is to be "born again," implying that our first birth is merely animal, and that another is necessary to make us men. It is to be "created anew," as though nothing could avail, but thorough dissolution and re-organization. Such miracles have been wrought in all ages.

Still, to see the ideal fully exemplified, we must again consider "the man, Christ Jesus." Perhaps, he did not design to display, in his own person, physical perfection. Perhaps he did not, mental perfection. But none can doubt, that he intended to exhibit, and did exhibit, moral perfection. What purity, sympathy, benevolence, in a word, what love, essential, efficient, unchangeable, and self-sacrificing love, did he disclose! Then, for once, the holiest inhabitants of heaven found on earth a character so divinely good, as to deserve their profoundest homage, and constant, adoring imitation. Morally, therefore, as well as physically and mentally, life, as now it seems, is far from being all it ever was.

But let us complete the historic review. What says the record, in respect of human relations? Socially and naturally, are these, as they seem, all they ever were?

As respects social relations, our attention is immediately challenged by a remarkable peculiarity. The intimations of perfection are not to be gathered from similar facts, here.

Even in this history, there is no example of domestic perfection! Nor is there any approximation to it, excelling what may be found, in christian society, in our own day. There might have been a perfect family in Eden, but the opportu-

nity was lost. No other has been afforded. The family in the ark was not perfect. The tents of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, had their jarrings. The home of Bethany, even when Christ was present, was not without its complaints.

Neither is there any example of civil perfection! In this respect, also, the past gains little, if any thing, from comparison with the present. The first law, was soon broken. The Jews were rebellious, even under the theocracy. All systems have been modified by circumstances, and soon shaken and overthrown.

Neither is there any example of religious perfection! The essential spirit of it has been bestowed; but no perfect and invariable form has been prescribed or illustrated.

These are great differences! How shall we account for them? These institutions are not perpetual. They are mere preparatives for the final and true organizations. God, at first, designed one family, one state, one church. He still designs the same. The first Adam forfeited his headship over all. The second Adam bears his three-fold office, in his stead. "Of Him, the Whole Family, in heaven and earth, is named," not Adamites, but Christians. He is the "Only Potentate, king of kings, and lord of lords." He is our great High Priest, the head over all things to the Church. That is, Jesus Christ is the Head of the Family, the Head of the State, and the Head of the Church. To the future results of His sovereignty, therefore, we are to look for the perfection of our social relations.

But, how is it, with natural relations? Here, again, we turn to an example of perfection. There is Eden, the Garden of the Lord: the whole earth, in its freshness, beauty, and brightness: the scene that surprised into ecstasy, "the morning stars and sons of God," and caused them to "sing together" and "shout for joy." God himself saw it was "good," i. e. like God; and styled it "very good," i. e. worthy of God. There can be no addition to that testimony. His smile rested on it. The beams of the sun, all day, and of the moon and stars, all night, were not so numerous, brilliant, or searching, as the silent benedictions of His countenance. Such, doubtless, he desired it to remain. It was impaired slowly, and by repeated efforts, as if reluctantly. Even after the curse fell, beauty lingered. Too much beauty lingered. Its charms were fatal. Therefore, the wreck of the deluge was added to the first blighting. That over, the Lord suspended His bow in the sky! But, it was not

bent downward. It was bent upward! It seemed to be strongly drawn, but no arrow was in it. It symbolized the turning away of wrath from the world, for the sake of Him who, standing by the throne, welcomed the sped arrow to His own blessed and bleeding bosom!

Still, the brief revelation of those first attractions is enough to remind us, that life, in these natural relations, also, is not all it ever was!

What, then, are the discoveries of observation? I use this term, for want of a better. It poorly expresses the purpose of its employment. I allude to a two-fold process, natural and spiritual, comprehending not only the things that are seen, but, also, the objects of faith, which is the evidence of things not seen. So understood, observation, rightly exercised, shows, that even now life is more than to the selfish it seems.

It may not be more physically, but, it is more, mentally and morally. The truth of revelation, to those who duly study it; and the holiness of revelation, to those who duly cherish it, make it more. It is more, relatively. There is a greater difference, than seems to be, between families, states, and religions; and in respect to personal connexions with external nature.

But, my chief allusion, here, is, to spiritual discernment. "God is not the God of the dead; but of the living." To Him, there are no dead! So, to us, on this theory, there are no dead! Enoch, Elijah, and, it may be, myriads who ascended with Christ, enjoy, this moment, the perfection of the human constitution. The miracles of the last day will have no application to them. They may see the resurrection of the dead, but not feel it. They may behold the change of the living, but not undergo it. They are what they shall be, forever. But these are few. The vast majority are "absent from the body." Yet, the "spirits of the just" are "made perfect." God sees them, and, standing in His light, we see them. Adam lives yet, and remembers his fall! Abel lives yet, and remembers his last sacrifice! Methuselah lives yet, and considers his stay on earth as the days of his childhood! Noah lives yet, with the surge of the flood still sounding in his soul! Abraham lives yet, and shudders to think how he held the knife over Isaac! Isaac lives yet, and remembers when he "went out to meditate in the field, at the eventide," and exchanged the dreams of hope for the smile of Rebekah! Jacob lives yet, and seems to recognize the angels which de-

scended and ascended, on the ladder at Bethel ! Joseph lives yet, and remembers the cry he could no longer restrain, "I am Joseph your brother !" Moses lives yet, and remembers Sinai and the law ! Joshua lives yet, and remembers how the sun and moon obeyed his bidding ! Samuel lives yet, and remembers how his appeal was answered by thunder, when Israel preferred the sceptre of Saul to the arm of Omnipotence ! David lives yet, and thrills heaven, as well as earth, with his Psalms ! And the Prophets live yet, watching their ancient predictions, as they turn into daily history, all over the world ! And the Apostles live yet, beholding the "fulness of the Gentiles" fast coming in, and waiting for the "blindness" of Israel to be removed, that all men may see the same Saviour, as they see the same sun ! And the Martyrs live yet ! Columbus, and Penn, and Washington, live yet ! Our fathers live yet. He who was buried yesterday, lives yet ! He who dies to-night, will be alive to-morrow ! The thousand millions of the visible living, are but a small minority in the presence of the hundred thousand millions of the invisible. Life is more than it seems !

But Prophecy, that is the chief of the witnesses. What does Prophecy say ? It is a glad distinction, that this theory is prophetic. All theories have histories, and the theory of selfishness a most voluminous history. But, the theory of benevolence, alone, is prophetic. Its hopes are emboldened by countless fulfilments in past ages. And it looks to two great triumphs in the future, the first, millennial—the second, eternal.

The first, as if in remembrance of the facts and intimations of original perfection, seems designed to restore the world to its primitive condition ; gradually prolonging life, by the removal of its oppressions, and the re-invigoration of the constitution by moral and natural influences, until it shall compare with the average of the early post-diluvian, and even with that of the ante-diluvian patriarchs : filling out, if fancy may speak for faith, the apparent original intention of a thousand years, so showing, in the end of the world, what was designed in its beginning, enriched by the advantages of all preceding ages of sad, but instructive experience. Then, the intellect shall disclose its power ! Then, the heart shall unveil its glory ! Then, the whole man shall display the utmost improvements possible, apart from the intervention of death ! Then, the social relations shall assume a fairer loveliness than they have ever yet

worn. Homes, such as the world might have had from the beginning, will throng and bless every land! States, such as the world might have had from the beginning, will extend the shelter of their common sovereignty over rejoicing and peaceful nations! And the churches of one Church will hallow the worshipping race! The natural relations, also, will put on new attractions. Eden, restored, will flush the globe with bloom. The beautiful demonstration will be made—how? when the mind is given to truth, and the heart, to love; and God's blessings are secured by faithful obedience; even a mocked world may be so overrun by exuberant felicities, and so invested in an atmosphere of the purest and serenest elements, and so adorned with the purpling splendors of a peaceful and benignant firmament, as nearly to forget the former curse, and cease to desire the coming renovation.

But, after all, speaking with clearer and deeper assurance, that renovation will come! The return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the transformation of the living, the conflagration of the earth, the judgment of all mankind, the creation of the new heavens and earth, the entrance of the redeemed into the fulness of immortal bliss, and the grandeur of eternal glory, these are the unequalled triumphs yet to be displayed. The resurrection of Lazarus will then find its intimations accomplished! The ascensions of Enoch and Elijah, will then find their symbols answered. The perfection of Adam, will have innumerable counterparts! The perfection of Christ then be imaged in all! The One Family will then be perfected! The One State, will then be perfected. The One Church, will then be perfected! And God, in Christ, will be all in all!

Now, such is life, on this theory! How much more has it been, than it seems! How much more is it, than it seems! How much more, will it be, than it seems!

What then? Is not here, the harmony of the constitutional and conditional? Is not here, the oneness of the real and ideal?

What are the teachings of the past? What, of the future? Perfection! But what does the present teach? Is it not imperfection? And is it not the necessity of effort, for personal and social redemption? Does not the object of life shine out? Is it not, to do good? How can we live worthily, unless we live thus?

What is it, but to take part with Jehovah, in the noblest of His works? What is it, but to comprehend the verities of immensity and eternity, understand our own interest in them, and elevate our affections and exertions to the great task of making it sure? What is it, but to extend the circle of blessings, from the centre of our own safety, to the limits of the world?

Now, therefore, which theory shall we adopt? Which doctrine believe? Which law, obey?

Metinks, if the theory of selfishness could be enlarged a little; if, for instance, it would allow me to live here ten thousand years, and all the resources of the globe were put at my command. I might attempt some plan of self-indulgence. I might build palaces, plant gardens, and gather delights, without number and without measure: palaces, unrivalled, for magnificence and splendor, even in the imaginings of the wildest of enthusiast architects; gardens, excelling even Eden itself; and delights, such as never yet have been collected about the richest and most luxurious of all the princes of the earth! But, for less than ten thousand, for less than one thousand, for less than five hundred, for less than one hundred, for less, it may be, than fifty, twenty, ten, five, for less, it may be, than one year, shall I, can I, believe that this is all, and set myself down to its selfish enjoyment? No, no, never! Or assure me that this is all, and again avow my first sentiment, I shall be proud to despise it! So, well I might be, to despise ten thousand years! for what are they, to infinity? But, in the littleness of our thoughts, there would be some excuse for valuing these.

What then? Bring me back to the true theory, the supernatural theory, the inspired theory, the theory of faith, of redemption, of Benevolence! Let me cherish this. Let me rejoice in this. Let me stand on the summit, whence the retrospect of the past, and the prospect of the future command both earth and heaven, both time and eternity. Let me see what I am! Let me feel what I am! Let me thrill with the sympathies of the living! Let me thrill with the sympathies of those whom the blind style the dead! And then, in harmony with all that is saintly, angelic, and Divine, let me come down to the fields of labor, with a heart, and a hand, for their largest demands!

"Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour:
The world hath need of thee:—"

We are selfish men.

Oh ! raise us up, return to us again ;
And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power.
Thy soul was like a star, and dwelt apart ;
Thou hadst a voice, whose sound was like the sea ;
Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free,
So didst thou travel on life's common way,
In cheerful godliness ; and yet thy heart
The lowliest duties on herself did lay."

Wordsworth ! in sooth, such words are little worth :
Where fadeless laurels roof his heavenly bower—
Well may our Milton rest.

The world hath need
Of Him, whose whispered peace entranced the storm :
And at whose death-shout, buried myriads rose !
Majestic on His throne, let Christ arise :
To breathe the same sweet spell o'er all earth's strife—
To raise a race with love, like His, to glow—
To make a thousand Miltons, silent now—
A thousand Howards, to relieve the poor—
A thousand Whitefields, to arouse the Church—
A thousand Wesleys, to secure the gain—
A thousand Henrys, freedom's soul to charm—
A thousand Washingtons—to guard her home !

ARTICLE III.

SACRAMENTAL MEDITATIONS ON THE PRESENCE OF THE
GLORIOUS BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY
SUPPER—TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR.
ERNST SARTORIUS.

By Rev. G. A. Wenzel, A. M., Philadelphia.

In the midst of the four holy gospels looms high, as a prominent sign of the glory of Christ, the history of the great feast or of the miraculous meal which he, in his compassionate love (Matt. 4, 14), provided, with a few loaves and fishes, for a great multitude, at a time, when the feast of the Passover was nigh, by increasing, whilst casting a look

of thankfulness to the Father, through the exercise of a creative influence, the substance of the provision a thousand-fold and with it refreshing thousands, that they should not perish by the way. This miracle having induced many among the people to follow him on account of the benefits conferred by the temporal bread, he reminds them in an incomparable discourse, that such bodily feeding by him with simple bread would not suffice, and that it was only a sign of an infinitely more excellent food which, proceeding from himself, perishes not, but endures unto eternal life, John 6: 26. After further inquiries on the part of the people he represents himself as the true bread of life, which had come down from heaven to give life to the world and eternal life to all, who should believingly receive and partake of it, and that, moreover, with thrice repeated emphasis and in contradistinction to the manna which Moses had given. (John 6: 35, 48, 51.) In these words is already contained, with an unmistakable reference to a more excellent future feast, the declaration, that a feeding with simple bread, even though miraculously blessed, cannot confer an eternal benefit, if the communion of his very essence be not united with it. The element and aliment, however, with and through which Christ gives eternal life, is not merely his eternal and divine essence which, from the day of creation, is life-creating, but also his human essence, which has since his incarnation been permeated with the former, or his flesh, which he gives for the life of the world which through sin has incurred the penalty of death. John 6: 51. It is this flesh together with its blood, the flesh and blood of a sinful race, which he has assumed and which in death he has offered up as an atoning sacrifice, and afterwards exalted to a higher and eternal life, which must also be received, appropriated and partaken of by those for whom it was given, and to whom it is to give eternal life, and that because it is itself a *pneumato-somatic* being both in a spiritual and bodily manner. As we have inherited from the first Adam his sin, guilt and death and, therefore, his entire *pneumato-somatic* being, so also shall, inversely, pass over to us from the second Adam his grace, righteousness and life, with his divine human essence, and consequently his glory shall also be revealed in and on us. It is a well founded remark by Chemnitz *Fundamenta Sacros. Coenæ* Cap. XI: *Christus non tantum ipse assumpsit nostram naturam, sed illam etiam nobis rursus restituit, ut hoc nexu assumptæ a nobis et nobis rursus communicatæ humanitatis*

suae subvehat nos ad communionem et communicationem cum ipsa divinitate.*) According to this Christ has not only assumed our flesh and blood in the womb of Mary, in order thereby to render satisfaction in our stead by his sufferings and death, and then, being glorified, exalt it to the participation and communion of his Divine glory, but he will also make us partakers of that human essence, which through him has been perfectly sanctified, renewed and glorified, and perpetuates its communion, together with all the benefits connected with it, to all Christians who, as the people of the second Adam, belong to his family, and in this way bring about continually their essential union with God and secure to them eternal life. They are not only to behold the glory which had been given him, and which essentially consists in the glorification of his human nature by the Divine, but they are also to receive it from him as a gift, so that they may be one with him according to the human nature, as he is one with the Father according to the Divine nature, John 17: 24.

The question which here consequently concerns us is, whether the spiritual properties, merits and blessings, which descend from the God-man Jesus to the human family, are only such as are also derived from other great and holy men, or whether he, as its new head and father, also communicates and perpetuates his bodily essence among its members. Not as if the essence was to be considered separate from those attributes and blessings, but also not inversely. Marriage is essentially a bond of love, fidelity and sacred bliss and therefore of a spiritual nature, for which reason it is also so frequently employed, in the Sacred Scriptures, as an analogy to that union, which exists between the Lord and his Church; yet it is, notwithstanding, not merely a spiritual, but also a bodily union, and is based not simply upon a union in love of the spirit, but also on that of the flesh and blood, by which the united life of the parents is continued and perpetuated in the children to new spiritual and bodily forms. A spiritual without a bodily union constitutes as little a marriage and family bond, as does a bodily without that spiritual which also animates the body. There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling,

*Compare Crysostom's 45th, Homily on the Gospel of St. John Chap. 6.

Eph. 4: 4. As this was the fundamental law of the original creation of the human family in Adam, so also is it the principle in its redemption and restoration in Christ. Adam has communicated to his posterity the whole of human nature; Christ has assumed the whole of human nature, and just as he has assumed it, so also does he communicate it, for he is the Redeemer and renewer of it entire. As erroneous as it would be to say, that Adam had only transmitted his body to his descendants, equally erroneous would it be to maintain, that Christ communicates to his people only his spiritual and not also his bodily life, and that these accordingly are indeed connected with the old Adam, both spiritually and bodily, but with the new Adam only spiritually. If this was so, then would the Holy Spirit, since the day of Christ's ascension be the only Mediator and Saviour of mankind, and Christ would only form with the Spirit of the Church one spirit, but not one body with its body; and that he became flesh would only be something entirely past, but no living presence, because he is no longer present to his Church.

The most important testimony from the lips of our Lord against any and every division* of his divine-human personality, and against all spiritualistical separation from the communication also of his bodily essence with us, is to be found in the discourse which he addressed to the people after the miraculous feeding, and which is not less miraculous than the miracle itself, John 6.† In striking contrast with the bread which he himself provided, as well as with the manna which under Moses had rained from heaven, he calls himself the bread of eternal life from heaven, designating this bread expressly as his flesh, which he was to give for the life of the world (v. 51), not indeed as separated, spiritless, dead flesh, which would profit nothing (v. 63), but his flesh filled and permeated with spirit and life by the life-giving Spirit from God. (v. 63). In Christ neither the spirit is to be separated from the flesh, nor the flesh from the spirit. Nothing but the concrete, the whole Christ, as manifested in the flesh, is

*Non autem dimidiatus tandem Christus, aut una duntaxat ipseus pars ecclesiae praesto est, sed toto Christi persona; ad eam autem pertinent ambae naturae, divina et humana. Form. Con. p. 783.

†Compare among the more modern commentators Scheidel (the Lord's Supper) Breslau, 1823, p. 241 ss.; especially Stier's Words of Jesus, Vol. II. p. 311 ss.; and Kahnis on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Leipzig 1851, p. 104 ss.

the true Christ. 1 John 4: 3, s.; 5: 20. Only as God-man is he the Saviour of mankind, renewing by his Spirit, not only our spirits, but by his flesh also our flesh. He has assumed our entire nature with soul and body, not to present it only once as a sacrifice, and then again re-assume it in its glorified state, and in this state retain it for himself alone. He rather desires to communicate and impart it continually to his people as meat and drink of eternal life; for his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed, and whoso eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood abideth in him and hath eternal life, and shall be raised by him with a body like unto his own glorious body (Phil. 3: 21), at the last day, v. 53-58.

The most decisive proof that the Lord, in his discourse after the feeding of the multitude, spoke of a feast still greater and more miraculous, that he intended to say something new, something extraordinary and, consequently, something till then unheard of, and especially promise the essential communication and participation of himself, of his bodily essence, is to be found in the feeling of incredulous and indignant surprise, with which his hearers were struck, and to which they gave utterance in the words (v. 60): This is a hard saying, who can hear it. It was on this account, too, that many of those, who had hitherto professed to be his disciples left him. v. 66. The indubitable fidelity of the narration finds its voucher continually in the fact, that Christ's words still produce the same impression on the minds of those who read them, which they originally produced on the minds of those who heard them. They appear to them in their literal sense so exceedingly hard, that they will not receive them, but mollify and weaken them in a way, which transcends the utmost limits of astonishment at the superficiality of a comprehension which is anything but profound. According to them the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ is to signify nothing more, than the receiving by *faith* those spiritual benefits which he has wrought out for us, by the surrender of himself on the cross, or in general, the believing reception of Christ in our souls. It is true, the Lord says in the preceeding verses, 35, 40, 47, concerning faith in him, what he afterwards declares in reference to the eating of his flesh, namely, that he who believeth in him hath eternal life. But it is also true, as the taste of the mouth is indispensable to the enjoyment of the food of which we partake, so also is the faith in the Lord indispensable to

the subjective possession and conscious enjoyment of salvation; yet as taste can on that account not render food unnecessary, so also can subjective faith not render unnecessary, the objective gift, or, in general, the reception, the corresponding communication. It rather appears, that both will ever remain equally necessary; for it would certainly be very preposterous in those who are betrothed, never to enter upon marriage, or consummate an actual union, simply because their betrothal already rendered them happy by faith. If the soul could be content without the body, or faith without the substance, the Lord would surely have acquiesced, and not, as he did afterwards, rendered conspicuous, with specific and repeated emphasis, the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood as necessary to eternal life. If this, which according to the text must evidently be added to faith as an essential enhancement of the union with Christ, or which is designated, not as a figurative but real eating, were nothing more than a mere figurative paraphrasing of faith, then indeed would the figurative elucidation be far more difficult to understand, than the thing itself, and therefore exceedingly wide of the mark. Moreover, it is but reasonable to suppose, that after the hardness and obscurity of his figurative saying had given such manifest offence, Christ, in order to remove its cause, would have gone back to the simple and more obvious idea of faith. Such, however, is not the case; Jesus only meets the astonishment of his disciples at his words with a reference to the sublime miracle of his ascension, which is the most glorious exaltation of his human essence. v. 62. And it is precisely by this allusion that he intimates to them, that he does not intend to feed his disciples with his unglorified, spiritless and dead body, nor with separate parts of it, but that he would communicate to them the substance, which, through the glorifying power of God, was as living, as it was life-giving, and thus unite himself essentially with them. According to this the wonderful saying of our Lord preserves its truthfulness and essentiality, and in doing so loses every thing of a repulsive and cruel nature, which could only attach to it, where the idea of dismembering the body or taking the life of one beloved could associate with it. Apart from this, the idea of one being, as living upon and enjoying another, is far from being repugnant, but on the contrary, something very delightful. We live and move and have our being in God; the child lives in and of the mother and grows, and drinks from her breast; and those united in marriage belong

to each other with heart and mouth, soul and body. Were the fruit-bearing tree, the vine, a living being, how willingly would it not offer the fainting its fruit, its clusters for refreshment! Christ lives and dies henceforth no more; he is the tree of life, the living and true vine, whose branches spread in every direction, whose grapes grow everywhere, and who yields his wine to the refreshing of all who have been received into his vineyard. He is the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, and his Church, is the second Eve, the mother of the living, who says concerning her Lord: Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth: for his love is better than wine. Song of Sol. 1: 1. For no one ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church, for we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they too shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and His Church. Eph. 5: 29-32. As assuredly as the apostle does not here speak abstractly of a mere spiritual bond, just as assuredly does Christ, John 6: 51-58, not treat of a mere spiritual partaking or a reception simply by faith of himself, but, also of a bodily partaking, by which we become members of his body; and as true as is the declaration, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, yet without sin," just as true is the declaration, after he has imparted of flesh and blood without sin, we must also become partakers of the same from him, or we are not children of the new generation, and his incarnation would, without a continual communication and communion, be indeed an important, but only a historical incident in redemption, not however—a perpetual element of it, but for the present unproductive.* The comparison of the union subsisting between Christ and his Church with the marriage union would not hold good, and especially what is said in Eph. 5: 30, "for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones,"† would be utterly untrue.

Great is the mystery of the incarnation, and great the mystery of the union of the God-man with his church and its members; but however great it may be, it is incontrovertibly

*Compare Schneckenburger's Christ's twofold state.

†See Harless' Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, in reference to this passage. Erlangen, 1834. He considers it as referring to the Holy Supper.

certain, that agreeably to the *pneumato-somatic* Person of the Lord, this union is not only a spiritual, but also a bodily union. The words of our Saviour spoken John 6, after the feeding of the multitude, afford a most incontestible proof. It is true, he gives us as yet no explanation as to how and by what means the feeding with the body and blood of the Lord is to be brought about and accomplished, but simply maintains its profitableness and necessity, and points to it as something yet future. v. 51. One of its benefits, however, he mentions particularly, namely, that it saves from death even after death, and preserves eternal life till the resurrection on the last day, v. 50 s. 53 s. 57 s. This was confessedly by the Fathers for the most part understood as meaning, that the body of the Lord received by us implanted into our perishable bodies an undying substance, a resurrection element, which does indeed not now, but which will hereafter, on the day of the general resurrection attain in the newly risen body to a full and life sustaining development. It must, however be assumed, that this more excellent body, which we have received from the Lord is of advantage to the soul even before this time, namely, at its departure from the body of this death, as its element of life, in order to afford its essence an essential support, to cover its nakedness and to ground itself in that building of God, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, 2 Cor. 5: 1 s., in the temple of the body of Christ, the risen One (John 2: 21 s.), with whom Paul longed to be at home, 2 Cor. 5: 8. Not as if the departed soul had no life and being without such a union with Christ. It indeed has, but according to the condition of its old being and body, not a salutary, healthy and loving life, but an unhealthy and feverish one, either shaking with cold and pining for warmth, or being consumed amid the heat of passion and longing for a cooling draught, Matt. 9: 12; Luke 16: 24. It is the realized communion of love with Christ alone which preserves the soul, which is at home with him (2 Cor. 5: 8), in a salutary and blessed life, preserves it in a glorified being with Christ, united and hidden with Christ in God, until it, when Christ, its life, shall again visibly manifest himself in his divine-human glory, shall be revealed with him in a newly raised and visible body in glory, Col. 3: 3 s. Then will he change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself (Phil. 3: 21); then too will he particularly as-

simulate those to himself in whom he has before had his seed and being, 1 John 3: 2.

Christ is our righteousness, Jer. 33: 16, our peace, Eph. 2: 14, our life, Phil. 1: 21. It is self-evident that, wherever the animated being or the living substance is to be found, there also are imparted the inhering qualities and attributes, and that, according to this, where the body and blood are received, there also are grace, forgiveness of sin, love, life and salvation imparted with it.* This, it is true, is done, in itself, already by the means of grace, namely, the word, just as men are able to give assurance among one another of their love merely in words. But are they on that account not also to prove their love by actions? Or is it only to be confined to the verbal declaration, without the privilege of shaking hands, kissing and embracing? Who will prevent the Lord from giving us more than his word of promise? Who will dispute his right to give to us not only his grace, righteousness and love, but with these also his life's prime, his glorified body, Divine (ambrosial) food, and give us to drink of the wine of his precious blood, which confers immortality, so that we may be altogether one with him? And who will presume to say, that he, together with his reconciling love, does not thus communicate and unite himself to his people more completely, more intimately and in a manner more profitable unto eternal life, than with the simple words? And if this very Word assures us, that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed, and when he calls upon us in the Holy Supper to take and eat, this is my body given for you, take and drink this is my blood shed for you, who will dare indulge in unhappy doubts.

Doubts, however, have been raised in reference to this very question, namely, whether Christ, in his discourse, recorded in John 6, treats of the Holy Supper at all. He of course does not treat in this passage of the sacramental enjoyment of his body and blood under the consecrated bread and wine in as much as he, on that occasion, neither instituted nor distributed it; neither could he have done so,

*Compare Luther's Sermon on Confession and the Sacrament, W. Vol. XI. p. 816 and 842 s. See also Vol. XX. p. 1057: "Where Christ remains to me, there everything else shall remain and be found." The Lord who gives himself to us, is himself the living pledge of all his benefits. The Father gives us all things in and with the Son, Rom. 8: 32. Compare on the separation of justification from the communication of life, Schneckenburger's Christ's two-fold State, p. 135.

because he had not yet offered up his body as the paschal lamb of the new covenant for the life of the world, John 6 : 51 ; 1 Cor. 5 : 7, nor glorified it for food of communication and communion. This was done only in the night, in which he was betrayed, and subsequently offered up, John 13 : 31. Justly, therefore, our older theologians, from Luther down, in their strict exegetical consistency declined, however much at first view it seemed to recommend itself, to deduce evidence from John 6, in proof of the presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine of the Holy Supper, not merely because such presence is fully established on other grounds, but because, in the case of the Supper all depends upon the words which the Lord employs in his testament concerning *bread and wine*, species of the sacrament, which here do not yet present themselves. That the discourse in John 6, in general refers to something yet unfulfilled, to something future, must be conceded even by those who, in opposition to its literal sense, conceive only a spiritual reception of Christ's spiritual benefits, in as much as these benefits were, at that time, not completed and the work of his redemption not yet finished. So also do we explain these words, namely, as they refer to a future offering (δωσω v. 51) of his body and blood upon the cross, so also do they refer to a future communication of them as meat and drink indeed for his disciples (v. 53 ss.), which he promises to them as certain and indispensable, and as proving fruitful to eternal life unto all who shall believingly receive them. When and how, with what and in what such food is to be provided and presented, what natural means and physical organs he is to appoint for the communication as well as for the reception of the supernatural gift, and in how far, therefore, that supersensuous enjoyment may be accommodated to our senses, and its benefits may be destroyed by unbelief—of all this Jesus says, John 6, as yet nothing ; for he treats here chiefly of the invisible essence of that living enjoyment, and not at all of its outward, visible form. We are, therefore, still at liberty to suppose, that the Lord will effect this in more ways than one, in the life that now is or in that which is to come. Yet we must, at the same time, confess that, whilst for himself, he is neither confined to the water in baptism, nor to bread and wine in the Holy Supper, he has yet bound us, and for us, has bound himself, through the sacramental institution, in such a way, that we, in his Church on earth, must receive his body and blood orally, there only, where

he himself has placed them for us, and where he, being present, gives them to us, namely, in the elements of the sacrament of the Holy Communion. The miraculous feeding of the multitude, together with the discourse of our Lord which succeeded it, is to us a significant type of the Holy Supper which, however, having at that time not been prepared, is also not defined in the discourse, but only prophetically pointed at, especially in v. 51. The settled (anti-spiritualistic) inference which we finally draw from this discourse is, that Christ's flesh is meat indeed, and Christ's blood is drink indeed for the members of his body, and is designed for us as food for eternal life. But how he realizes this miraculous feeding within the sanctuary of his Church, whose present and not absent high-priest he is, and how he communicates the holy sacrifice of himself and makes us partakers of his glory, this we can learn only of him, out of his own mouth, in the institution and sacramental appointment of his Holy Supper, in humility and in the obedience of faith.

2. Concerning the institution of the Holy Supper for the Communion of the glorified Body and Blood of Christ.

(a) The time when instituted.

In the night, in which our Lord Jesus Christ, after having for the last time eaten the Old Testament Passover with his disciples, *was betrayed* for thirty pieces of silver, he instituted, in a divinely glorious manner, the sacrificial feast of the New Testament, in which he gives himself, under the consecrated bread and wine, to his disciples as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, offering his life for the redemption of the many, so that, justified from their sins, they might be one in him, and partake of the glorification of his human nature through the divine glory, John 17 : 22-24. Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, says Paul 1 Cor. 5 : 7 ; *i. e.* slain and offered for us upon the cross, stained with his blood, and gratefully received by us in the Holy Supper, which he himself instituted in the night in which he was betrayed. The four accounts of the institution of the Holy Supper, which are in essential agreement with each other, bring it into immediate connection with the betrayal by Judas Iscariot, whom Satan had hardened, Luke 22 : 3 ss., John 13 : 2, 27. The first two Evangelists, Matt. 26 and John 14, only mention, in their account of the last meal which Jesus ate with his Apostles, the be-

trayal by one of their number, immediately after which the words of institution follow, and then they only give his parting declaration, "I will not drink henceforth of this cup of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Paul, who in 1 Cor. 11, only records the words of institution which he had received from the Lord, still adds, *in the night in which he was betrayed*. It is clear, that in these several accounts there is not a mere fortuitous or external co-incidental agreement in point of time, but an inner causative agreement. The accomplishment of the hellish betrayal, the commencement of the deliverance of Christ into the hands of the unjust, is the beginning of his being offered up. But as he says in reference to his life, no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself (John 10 : 18), it was fit, when the betrayal began, not only to permit it to take place, passively, but at once also to meet it, by presenting himself before his disciples as a free-will offering for the sins of the world, and really to consecrate now body and blood, as an offering on behalf of his people. There was met the greatest sin by the greatest grace, the most wicked act of the devil, by the most holy act of God, the enmity of Satan, by the mercy of Christ, hellish cunning by heavenly wisdom, which brings the greatest good out of the greatest evil. The announcement of his betrayal, therefore, forms the introduction to the institution of the holy sacrificial feast which, in the New Testament, takes the place of the sacrifice which commemorated the deliverance out of the bondage of Egypt, and which was to place all the members of the new covenant in connection with its head. It is therefore well established that the announcement which so greatly afflicted and humiliated the disciples precedes, in the gospels of Matthew and Mark, the, in its turn, again elevating and comforting institution of the sacrament. This arrangement must be preferred to that of Luke, who lets the announcement of the betrayal, chap. 22 : 21, follow after the words of institution by way of supplement, so much the more so, because, other sayings uttered by our Saviour at the last supper recorded by him, have not, on the whole, any internal connection and appear one and all to be subordinated to the principle subject, namely, the words of institution of the sacrament. Neither can it be supposed that the Lord would, after the first communion, disturb or obliterate the profound and comforting impression made upon his disciples by it, by announcing to them that there was a be-

trayer among their own number, which could not but have sorely distressed and humiliated them. If we, therefore, follow the order, observed by the two evangelists, of whom Matthew also mentions, immediately after the announcement, Judas as the betrayer, chap. 26 : 25, it also follows of necessity from John 13 : 30, that the betrayer here mentioned, went away immediately after having received the sop, and that after this his excommunication,* by which the ban of his diabolical presence was removed, the institution of the holy communion took place. The words of institution do, however, not follow in John as they do in Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul, where they are recorded in essential agreement with each other, simply because they were in their fixed form already at that time the common property of the Church. Yet John gives where the words of institution ought to be introduced, immediately after the mention of the going out of the betrayer in the night, (13 : 30) in the night in which he was betrayed, 1 Cor. 11 : 23, the words of our Saviour, which serve as a solemn introduction to them, v. 31 s., now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself, and shall straightway glorify him. With these words of Christ, pronounced in the most direct consciousness of the glorifying presence and indwelling of God was to be connected, rather than with any other passage in John, without further parenthesis the self-glorifying word of the institution of the sacrament, *and he took the bread, gave thanks,† brake it, &c.* This the greatest proof of resigning, sympathizing, uniting love, which the Lord gives and bequeathes to his people in the holy communion, as he departs from them according to his temporal corporeality, is very aptly followed by the tender expressions, such as, little children, yet a little while I am with you, &c., and a new

*From this excommunication the un-evangelical deduction must, by no means, be drawn, that the communion ought not to be administered to poor sinners, but only to complete and holy disciples. How little the disciples were deserving of these predicates at the first Supper, the Lord himself witnesses with regard of all by saying: Ye shall all be offended because of me this night, Matt. 26 : 31, and to Peter in particular, v. 34. But on the other hand, had the Satanic betrayer not been excluded from the holy communion, no other excommunication could ever take place.

†Analogous to the looking up to God before the miraculous feeding, Matt. 14 : 19, and before the raising of Lazarus, by which was manifested the glory of God, John 11 : 40-43.

commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you, v. 33 s.

It is certainly worthy of attention, that in the same place, where in the other evangelists we find the betrayal by Judas in immediate connection with the institution of the Holy Supper, we find in John a witness by Christ in reference to God being glorified in him, which he uttered on that night, at the moment, when the betrayer had gone out to deliver him into the hands of his enemies, John 13: 31. Whatever may be said in regard to the above explanation of this connection, it is still impossible to invalidate this clear and explicit testimony concerning the institution of the communion of the body and blood of Christ under the consecrated bread and wine, which belongs to his glorification and which took place in the same night. It is indeed surprising how, in opposition to this testimony, the objection could have been urged, Jesus could in that night not have given his glorified body and blood, because not yet glorified,* though he himself declares most expressly, now is the Son of man glorified (*ἰν εδοξασθη*) and God is glorified in him. When immediately after he continues, If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself (*ἰν εαυτω*) and shall straightway glorify him, v. 32, he distinguishes the glorification of God in the Son of man, which is just now taking place, from the glorification of the Son of man in God, which was to take place soon after. This belongs to his exaltation, and is an intensified glorification of the Son of man into the majestic glory of God; whilst the former, still belongs to his humiliation, is the condescending glorification of the glory of God in the form as a servant of the Son of man, full of grace and truth. Such a condescending glorification, corresponding to the gentler manifestations of his glory in the miracles of grace, and culminating in that perfect love which is great in serving, giving and resignation, meets us on the last night in which he was betrayed, and in which he instituted the sacrament of the communion. The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and give his life a ransom for many; these words find their fulfilment especially on the sacred night of the institution of the Holy Supper. I am among you as he that serveth saith the Lord, Luke 22: 27; John 13: 13 s.; and comes with water, to purify and

*See Ebrard's *Dogma of the Holy Supper*. Frankfurt, 1845. Vol. 1. p. 109.

sanctify his disciples, whilst washing their feet, yea comes still closer to form an essential union with them, by glorifying for them, as his little children, John 13: 33, with more than maternal resignation, the substance of his flesh and blood as food for eternal life. *Now is the Son of man glorified and God is glorified in him.* Surely this is no figurative or typical expression, no poetic fancy (*ωραιοποιεῖς*); this is grace and truth: this is a great reality of Divine love, an unquestionable evidence of a real communication of Divine life and attributes to the human nature of the Son of man which permeated by it and permeating even its own natural limits, now also mediates, communicates and distributes unseen the life and immortality which it has received. The time of such glorification, after the son of perdition, into whom the Prince of darkness had entered, had gone out to betray his Master, the point of time at which the offering up of Christ begins, and from which his suffering, death and departure take their date is, therefore, just as prominently established, as it tends to our establishment. The hour has now come in which his promise, John 6: 51, is being fulfilled, *the bread that I will give (to eat) is my flesh*, which I will give (as a sacrifice) *for the life of the world*; now, on this holy night, is the time when he makes his testament (Heb. 9: 15), bequeathing to believers in the sacrament of thankful devotion, the treasures of his grace together with his continual gracious presence; now is the time in which he seals the new testament, the new covenant in his blood, by making the members of the covenant, the apostles, who represented the whole Church, partakers of his blood in the cup of the covenant, and by receiving them, through the bread of blessing, into the communion of his body, and by commanding them to do the same in future.

(b) Concerning the bread.

Therefore, conscious of his glorification, and conscious also that God was glorified in him, and feeling his soul, body and blood, interwoven with its wonderful power, and recognizing himself, at the same time, whilst seated at the table of the passover, as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and gives it life, Jesus took the bread, gave thanks, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, *Take and eat, this is my body.* We will first consider this passage by itself, as recorded in Matthew and Mark. These words, which

are as definite as they are pregnant, and which connect* by the simple copula bread and the body of Christ, have been so thoroughly examined in every respect, exegetically as well as grammatically, and at the same time with a glance at the exposition of the fathers (compare Kahnis on the dogma concerning the Lord's Supper, p. 170 ss.) and the true sense of the substantives as well as the copula has been so comprehensively and thoroughly discussed and established, both by ancient as well as by more modern theologians, that the attempt, to offer anything new, would be a vain presumption. We will therefore, only confine ourselves to the task of proving, that the glorification of our Lord throws, in an essential point of view, not a little light upon these most important words.† Even though Christ had, on that night, not referred to his gentler glorification, the words of institution would still force us to explain them, as relating to his body in a glorified state, because it could not at all be said of the unglorified, natural, material and confined body, take *eat*, this is my body. Such an eating could neither be taken in a real (capernaitish) sense, as a mortiferous dismemberment of Christ's flesh, nor in a signficatory sense, because it would be equally monstrous to imagine, in the form of bread, the natural compact body figuratively, and then to eat it up, commemoratively in effigy; for a figurative memorial ought rather to be preserved. It must be borne in mind, that the Lord is still externally present among his disciples with his visible body, at the institution of the Supper, whilst his essence consecrated to them, discloses and glorifies itself to them from within, for a communication and communion. It is the energy of the divine glorification of his human nature, through which the holy body of Christ surrounds itself dynamically, with the invisible eradiations and emanations of his essence, which as yet, he keeps veiled, but which he also permits to become visible in his glorious exaltation at the right hand of the

*This copula has, as is well known, the same copulative and communicative sense in those sentences which denote the unity between the Godhead and humanity in Christ, or the relation of the word to its spirit and import (as for instance, John 6: 63, Rom. 1: 16,) or even the twofold nature of man, according to which both natures are imparted to him, neither of them figuratively, but both in like literalness, viz: that he is earth and flesh, (Gen. 3: 19; 6: 3,) as well as a living soul, Gen. 2: 7.

†See the most excellent Communion-book, by Kapff, 6 Ed. Stuttg. 1851, §15.

father as a cloud of glory. The very same body which is first to be given for his people as a bloody sacrifice, and then become a new and eternally glorified body, he designs to communicate to them in a holy mystery of love, for an essential communion with him the Head, which assimilates its members to itself. This he does by offering to them, for their participation, the visible consecrated bread, with the words, *This is my body*, in an invisible, imponderable, miraculous manner, by surrounding and permeating the consecrated food, which he touches with his hands and blesses by the word of his mouth, with that invisible breath or emanation and influence of the glorified substance of his body, and thus exalting it into communion with it. Therefore he, the true witness (Rev. 3 : 14,) who, in the making of his testament, certainly employs no equivocal figurative language, and in whom all types and shadows are embodied (Col. 2 : 17,) says, in perfect, real verity concerning the broken bread, whilst abrogating and changing its previous natural designation, *Take, eat, this is my body*. Yea, verily, what he bids them now to eat is what he, the Lord, the All-powerful says it is, namely, his body, his true body; because he, in whom all the fulness of the God-head dwells bodily, mysteriously fills and fructifies it with the true, most intensive, or most essential essence of his body. In such a dynamical communicative manner then is the consecrated bread the body of Christ. Herein is also contained a refutation of the assertion, that only a detached piece, a small fragmentary part of the body of Christ, can be present in the bread and not his whole essence, which fanatics of reason declare absolutely impossible. Luther, in his sermon on the sacrament against the fanatics says, in reference to this comminuting view, and in answer to the objection founded upon it, very aptly, W. vol. XX p. 930, "If they would only properly examine a little seed or a cherry, these might teach them *more*," for in the little seed is contained the entire plant. Those who object, that such little seeds, such essential elements of life in the bread are not perceptible by the senses, and therefore, also not real and operative, should well consider, how imperceptible those imponderable potencies or substances are, which exert an influence upon the physical health of man, and how powerful, nevertheless, their influence is. The consecrated bread is therefore the body of Christ, because as the vehicle of, his communication of it, it is inherently participant of and essentially participates in it, as Paul testifies, when he 1 Cor.

10: 16, explains the words of institution by paraphrasing them: *the bread we brake is the communion (κοινωνία, communicatio, participatio) of the body of Christ, and the cup which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ*; or as the Church expresses it, Christ's body and blood is in, with and under the bread and wine.*

It is also clear and indisputable from what Paul says, that the institution of the Holy Supper, of the Lord which he reports as having received from the Lord (1 Cor. 11: 23 ss.) in language as strong and solemn as that employed by the evangelists, possesses and ever will possess the same power of blessing and communication after, as it possessed before Christ's ascension, when he was yet visibly present among his disciples, though, already, temporary in a higher state of glorification. But now being in his state of exaltation he partakes also of the highest glorification, and is, at the right hand of the father, limited neither by space nor time, and can, therefore, execute his high-priestly testament, in his Church, at all times and in all places, really and truly, as he *wills* it, according to his word.† The bread, which his servants consecrate, by repeating over it his testamentary words, is therefore, at present, what it was at the time of the apostles, his body, because it has and is the communion of his body. How poor would we be, how empty would appear the Lord's Supper, if he, the principal personage, should be wanting at his table, if he had only been essentially present at its institution, but was now removed from it, as far as heaven is distant from earth, and would leave us to celebrate the marriage feast without the bridegroom, without bodily communion with him.

The bread of the holy communion cannot be the body of Christ, in any other way, than by the holy communion of this body with it, which on the part of the Lord depends actively upon the *communication* of his essence with the bread, and on the part of the bread, passively upon its *participating* in the essence of the Lord. The bilateral word κοινωνία expresses both united, and in consequence of this union between Christ's body and the bread, *which we brake*, still a third is expressed, namely, that the bread mediates our communion with the body of the Lord, which it could not do, if itself had no communion with it. Only through this is it in

*See Form. of Concord. De Coena Domini, p. 735.

†See for proof our Article on Christ's exaltation.

the sacrament of communion the body of the Lord, also making all, who receive it, partakers of this one body, 1 Cor. 10: 17,* just as he who partakes of the passover, enters, by so doing, into an essential communion with the altar and the sacrifice upon it. v. 18 ss. comp. Matth. 20: 23. The bread cannot be, or become the body, the true body of Christ and establish communion with it, by having its substance changed or transubstantiated into that of the body. For if the material of the bread was to be changed or transformed into the substance of the body of Christ, this would be a new body, formed or assumed out of the material of the bread, but not the historical, true body, born of the virgin Mary, and given for the sins of the world upon the cross; and what would then become of the essential communion with the true Christ? The advocates of transubstantiation are conscious of the difficulty. Hence they assume that the material of the bread is not actually transubstantiated in the consecration, but rather annihilated, and that then, the *accidentals*, such as form, taste, smell, weight, &c., only remaining, the substance of the body of Christ is put in the place of the substance of the bread. But according to this the body which occupies this empty semblance of a form, would either have to be created out of nothing, in which case it would again be merely the unhistorical body of the Lord, which would not stand in, nor bring it into connection with his crucified body, or it must be assumed, that this true body enters, by the communication of the living Christ, into communication and a replenishing and incorporating union with the form of bread. The first of these assumptions carries absurdity upon its very face, because it is in opposition,† not only to the words of institution which speak of the true, already present body of the Lord, but also to the essence of his holy communion. The second assumption, however, approaches nearer to our doctrine, and compels to an acknowledgement of its correctness as well as to a reception of the truths associated with it, namely, those concerning the presence and glorification of the human nature of the Lord through the *communicatio idiomatum* of the Divine, without which there is in general, no

*The unity of the body of Christ does not only depend upon the communion of the same spirit, (1 Cor. 12: 13; Eph. 4: 4.) but also upon the same body, which is received in the bread.

†This assumption is rejected even in the Romish Catechism. See Catechism. Roman. p. II. c. 4, qu. 31.

consistent representation of the presence of the whole Christ in his Church. All that therefore really still remains to be considered, is the difference in the phraseology employed. What are denominated the accidentals of the bread, are the entire characteristics which remain even after the act of consecration has been performed. Now if it be logically true, that a combination of all the characteristics of a thing is equal to the whole, or to the idea of the thing itself, it seems the same, whether we say the substance of Christ unites itself to the bread, or it unites itself to its accidents. The Roman Catholics, however, are unfortunately unwilling to show any leaning to this our view, though ever so well and firmly established. They insist upon the transubstantiation and annihilation of the substance of the bread, though all its entire characteristics are to remain and adhere to the body of Christ only as accidental, whose substance must now be conceived of just as entirely destitute of individual characteristics, as the characteristics of the bread must be conceived of without proper substance (predicates without a subject.)* Both, the transubstantiation of the essence, as well as the annihilation of the earthly element contradicts the internal connection or *analogy of faith*, which throughout requires a loving union (*unio* and *communio*) of the heavenly and earthly, and regrets the changing or transubstantiation of the one into the other, just as *monophysitical* as the mere presence of the earthly in appearance is *docetic*. Though there are evidences in the 1 chap. of the B session of the council of Trent, of an approach to our doctrine concerning the sacramental union (*unio sacramentalis*) of Christ with the earthly elements of the Supper, transubstantiation, is nevertheless positively maintained in chap. 4, as *conversio totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus*, according to which we behold in the sacrament nothing but a new or added body of Christ, produced by the transformation of the bread, or a bread sublimated to be his body, and in which is received, not so much the glorified Son of man, as the glorified bread of man; not so much the glorified substance of Christ, as the glorified transubstantiated substance of the bread. The earthly element is thereby exalted and potenti-

*The Catechismus Romanus, p. II. c. 4, qu. 37, represents it as a great miracle (*supra omnem naturæ ordinem*) that the predicates of the bread can exist by themselves without their subject (*sine aliqua ipsa se sustentent*). Verily a great miracle of logic.

ated upward to the heavenly, much more than the heavenly lets itself down to the earthly, glorifying and imparting glorification to it, and the body of the Lord appears rather receptively increasing and receiving, than actively communicating and imparting itself. All this stands, of course, in intimate connection with that Catholic view concerning the eucharist, according to which it is to be more a sacrifice offered by men from below, than a gift of God bestowed from above, more an odor of the earth, than a dew from heaven, more an officium, than a beneficium, more a sacrificium, than a sacramentum. In what connection the bread which, through the sacrificing priest, is changed into the body of Christ, stands with the Christ who, according to his bodily essence, has been exalted to the right hand of God, and how it is in general connected with the presence of Christ in his Church, —concerning this the Tridentine theology, has formed no internally connected idea, but contents itself with disdainfully rejecting our own. It is on this account principally they tie the essence of Christ in heaven (*juxta modum existendi naturalem*, Sess. XIII c. 1.) just as much locally to his seat at the right hand of God, as it cleaves on earth to the transubstantiated bread, so that, in general, the essential presence of Christ is only recognized and shut up within such separated circumscription, and here only within this narrow material form (and that often only in pyxide,) in which only it is adored. The attempt is indeed made to escape the limitation connected with these views, by maintaining that there are indeed not merely fragmentary parts of the essence of Christ present in these shadows of bread and wine, but the whole and complete (*totus et integer*) Christ, God and man indivisibly in each of these shadowy forms. It is, however, impossible to let this entire divine-human presence proceed only from the substance of bread and wine, and to include (*contineri*) it in their remaining semblance, without an approach to blasphemy; but in order to be assured of his essential presence, we must go back to the *self-communication* of the living glorified Christ, from which men should never have departed.

The monstrous idea, that the entire substance of the bread and wine, are transubstantiated into the entire substance of the humanity and, therefore, also into the divinity of Christ, must vanish before the truth of our doctrine, according to which the bread is the body of Christ through the penetrating communication of the essential presence of the God-man,

which is not shut up in it, but surrounds that which penetrates, as radii surround a centre. According to this view an insignificant material substance is not puffed up by our own high-flown thoughts, as being the entire, great and adorable Christ; but the entire Christ collects and concentrates the radii of his essential presence in the insignificant bread, with Divine condescension,* in order thereby to manifest himself to his little ones on earth, or to give himself to them, wholly as their own, in the manna of the holy communion. Thus also is the small pupil of the human eye not too small, to concentrate within itself the light of heaven and earth;† and how small is, according to the poet "earth's little O" compared to the heavenly orb above us, which scatters his rage everywhere upon it. How much such condescension of the Divine glory, such gracious manifestation of the greatness of God, in that which is small, accords with the analogy of the Divine manifestations in general; concerning this we refer the reader to our meditations on that subject, in which it is clearly shown, that in all such manifestations a change of the earthly substance into the Divine essence never takes place, nor is the latter ever shut up in the former, but only glorified by permeating it.‡ It is an indwelling, which is at the same time a surrounding, a communication, by which the earthly does not shine in its own light, but in that which is communicated to it. The bread and wine become glorified not through a glory which proceeds out of themselves, but through a glory which shines around and whose rays penetrate them, and in which the presence of the Lord, like the Divine presence in the cloud reveals as well as conceals itself (*praesens latens*, as Augustine has it). As at the first Supper he was yet visibly present at his table, so also is the Lord invisibly present at every one of its subsequent celebrations, and that not only in and with, but also *under* and *over* the bread and wine, in as much as he is not only the living food, but also the personal host at his table and the high-priest at his altar, whose gifts he consecrates,

*This is what Luther calls *praesentia definitiva*. As he also expresses it in his communion hymn, *Jesus Christ our Saviour*, v. 2, he gives to us his body, hid in bread so small.

†Compare Luther's large Confession concerning the Lord's Supper, W. Vol. XX. p. 1266 s., and Raimundi de Sabundi *Theologia naturalis*, 293.

‡Wie das Licht durchscheint das Glas,
Und doch nicht versehret das.

blessees and distributes. The table, or altar of the New Testament must not be compared to the altar of the outer court of the Old Testament, on which were laid the bloody sacrifices, but to the altar of incense (altar of prayer, Luke 1: 10; Rev. 5: 8; 8: 3) within the holy place, with the candlestick*) and the table of shew-bread and vessel of wine at its side, near the concealed Most Holy place whose veil is not impenetrable. It has been drawn aside, since the eternal high-priest Jesus has, by his own blood, entered within the invisible and eternal holy of holies, and has seated himself as dispenser of the Divine gifts on the mercy seat at the right hand of the throne of the majesty (Heb. 8: 1 s.), whose train fills heaven and earth, and especially the temple. (Isaiah 6: 1).

Now whenever the Holy Supper is celebrated within the sanctuary of his Church, into which we have the boldness to enter by the blood of Christ, and when, whilst the holy, holy, holy of the seraphim is sung, the mysterious veil of the exalted holy of holies is drawn aside, and he, the high-priest of his house, who does not dwell afar off, only at the goal above, but prepares himself to us for a new and living way, which he has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his glorified flesh, (Heb. 10: 19, 20), he comes and blesses the bread and wine under the prayers of his priestly servants, and by virtue of his word, *This is my body, this is my blood*, consecrates it to an essential communion of his body and blood. This he does, being efficaciously present at his holy altar, and his presence is therefore by no means only inclusively in the bread and wine, but is in general at his holy table, although he reveals here not so much his royal glory, as rather his high-priestly compassion, and is to be profoundly adored during the continuance of the Holy Supper, but especially during its reception. This is not urged upon us by an express command of the Lord as a legal duty or as an act of homage, which we are bound to render, but rather, and so much the more, by a spontaneous impulse of grateful devotion and holy reverential awe at his gracious presence, and in consequence of a profound appre-

*The corresponding custom, to burn candles upon the altar is at all events a significant symbol justifiable on Bible grounds, and should least of all be denounced by those who regard the sacrament only as a significant symbol or typical sign. "It, at any rate, signifies light," replied on one occasion a simple-minded Lutheran to a Zwinglian opponent.

ciation of his deep condescension.* As soon as the act of communion, which has been performed agreeably to the institution, is at an end, the high-priestly blessing of its mediatorial elements ceases also, because the consecratory intention is not put forth for the sake of the impersonal elements, but for sake of the living communicants.† The conclusion of the communion instituted by our Lord, discontinues, at the same time, with the ceasing of the communication of his body and blood to the communicants, also the preconditioning communication of them to the elements, which again return, as consecrated, but now empty vessels, to their natural condition, just like a mirror which reflected the sun as long as he shone upon it, becomes dark as before as soon as his light is withdrawn. Transubstantiationists, on the contrary, who maintain, that the bread is changed by a momentary creative act into the substance of Christ, regard this Christ, thus created, immanently and permanently united with the form of bread, apart from the communion and without continued communication and, in this groundless illusion, pay to it a homage, which can only be looked upon as idolatrous. In short, the doctrine of the evangelic-orthodox Church stands firm, namely, the bread which we receive in the Holy Supper is not the body of Christ, *given for us*, in consequence of a change of its entire substance into the body of Christ, but in consequence of a communication‡

*Compare Luther, W. Vol. XIX. p. 1616 s. and Formula of Concord, p. 760.

†Upon this is based the canon : *Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo institutum.*

‡To call this communication, as some do, "consubstantiation" is inadvisable, because an intermixture of both substances might easily be inferred from it. Insubstantiation, incorporation or impanation would on the other hand too readily convey the idea of an *inclusio localis*. To regard communication less as an imparting (*Mittheilung*) of the essential presence of Christ, and more as an assumption of the elements into the communion of the essence of Christ, would not give sufficient prominence to the difference between the *unio personalis* which takes place by assumption and the *unio sacramentalis*, and not enough to the individual substantiality of the elements. The term *communicatio* or *κοινωνία*, based on 1 Cor. 10: 16 is accordingly the most suitable and theologically most correct and corresponds best of all with the name and idea of communion, which is as full of meaning, as that of the mass, both in the Latin and German languages, is unmeaning and which especially in the latter is too readily associated with the idea of a commercial transaction

communion and union (*unio sacramentalis*) of the body of Christ with the substance of the bread.

(c) Concerning the sacrifice in the Holy Supper.

The addition, which Luke and Paul make to the words, *Take and eat, this is my body*, in the words, *given or broken for you,* do this in remembrance of me*, proves so much the more, that the question in reference to the sacramental institution, the observance of which he commanded to his Apostles for the whole future for his Church upon earth in perpetuum memoriam, is not at all concerning the production and offering up of a new body of Christ, but rather concerning the communicating of his historical body, given or offered for us on the cross, and received by us in grateful believing (eucharistic) remembrance of the wonderful benefits of the gracious and merciful Lord, (Ps. 111: 5), and in so doing we show forth his death till the day of his coming, 1 Cor. 11: 26. There, when the Lord of glory, obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, was crucified, there he has once for all finished the perfect sacrifice of reconciliation, which renders satisfaction for the sins of the whole world and which is to remain ever present to the memory of believers, and is to be continually appropriated to them anew in the sacrament.

Not that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others, but he has entered by his own blood once for all into the holy of holies in heaven, and by one offering hath perfected forever them that are sanctified, having obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. 9: 12-25; 10: 14. It is a principal design of the epistle to the Hebrews (comp. chap. 9 and 10)

*The word *κλῶμενον* which Paul uses in 1 Cor. 11: 24 does not alter the sense, but only emphasises the violent wounding and mortal surrender of his body for us. To make *κλῶμενον*, *δεδομενον*, *ἐκχυρομένον* refer to the distribution at the table, a sense in which even Luther at one time thought, though only interrogatively, to apply it (W. Vol. XX. p. 1330 ss.) is not admissible, already because it would then not read *ὕπερ ἡμῶν*, but *ὑμῶν*. That, as for the rest, the participium praesentis stands in the words of institution, is very correctly explained by Chemnitz in his *Examen Concilii Trident.* p. II. loc. VI. Art 5, Christus in Coena per praesent tempus locutus est; erat enim tunc in ipso actu passionis, quae consummata est in cruce. Compare what has already been said above in reference to the betrayal. See also Stier on the Holy Supper in his "Words of Jesus (printed separately) Barmen 1855. p. 46, *δίδομενον* according to Wiener, "which is about to be given over."

to show to the people of Israel, that the many and continual expiatory sacrifices offered by the priests and high-priests of the old covenant could, by reason of the imperfection of those who offered them, not make perfect according to conscience, i. e. not provide for the complete forgiveness, righteousness and holiness, but they were only to keep them in mind of their sins, and serve as a type of their reconciliation, till in Christ the perfect high-priest should appear who, with his own body and blood, brought once, in the most holy obedience, the most perfect and eternally valid offering, and with it established in the God-man a reconciliation between God and man so complete, that no repetition of it, or further expiatory sacrifice for sin is necessary, Heb. 9: 25; 10: 10-17. That which according to the New Testament is now more especially required, is the dispensation of this complete offering to those who are to be sanctified thereby, the communication of the grace and forgiveness of sin obtained through it and the boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Christ, which was shed for and is offered to us in the cup of the new covenant, together with the body which we receive in the bread of his table; it is required, that we draw near to the mercy seat with a true heart in full assurance of *faith*, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, holding fast the profession of our faith, without wavering, being fruitful in love and good works and not forsaking the assemblies of the saints, Heb. 10: 14-24. These are the fundamental features of the evangelical Christian cultus. In whatever other passages the altar or table of Christians is mentioned, (Heb. 13: 10; 1 Cor. 10: 18-21), there we find, as we do in the words of institution, allusions to the eating of his offering, the drinking of his cup, and the sacrificial feast of his communion, but nowhere anything concerning an expiatory sacrifice first to be offered, and by which the grace of God is to be acquired. Yet notwithstanding all this, the Council of Trent, which treats separately in two sessions, separated by a long interval (Sess. XIII. and XXII.) of the *sacrament* of communion, or the eucharist and the *sacrifice* of the mass, as if they were two entirely different institutions, maintains, that that sacrament, which presupposes the grace of reconciliation and communicates it from above, is also inversely a true expiatory sacrifice (*sacrificium vere propitiatorium*), which produces grace and acquires it from below. It is true, in the 1 chap. of the 22nd session it is at first still represented as in more

intimate connection with the definition of the sacrament, laid down in the 13th session only as a commemorative offering, a bloodless representation of the bloody sacrifice on the cross, to preserve its memory to the end of the world and to apply its salutary fruit to the forgiveness of *daily sins*.* But in the 2nd chapter the sacrifice of the mass is put on the same level with the bloody sacrifice on the cross as a true propitiatory sacrifice (*cujus oblatione placatus Dominus, gratiam et donum pœnitentia concedens, crimina et peccata, etiam ingentia, demittit*), because the same Christ is contained in it (*idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui se ipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa*). Yea it is actually placed above it, because specially to its attribute as an expiatory sacrifice is added also the sacramental attribute, according to which the benefits, flowing from the bloody sacrifice, are also plentifully to be received through the bloodless sacrifice. Hence it is not only properly offered (*rite offertur*) for the satisfaction and other necessities (*necessitatibus*) of the sins and punishments of living believers, but also for those who have died in Christ, but are still in purgatory, so that it may also satisfy for the satisfaction of Christians yet due, after the satisfaction of Christ has been received, or at least aid, in connection with other good works, in rendering satisfaction.

In opposition to these confused dogmas and confounding misinterpretations of the Holy Supper, it becomes us to state clearly and distinctly the antithesis of the evangelical truth in connection with all its previous deductions. As certainly as the Lord is more than his disciples, whom he, in the night in which he instituted his Supper, calls little children (John 13 : 33); as certainly as he is more than all the servants of his Church and all men, so certainly is the holy communion not what men do at it, or bring to it (the sacrificial or sacrifice), but what the Lord does and gives and communicates at it (the sacramental, the Divine gift), and of which he says, take, eat, this is my body. We are as far from overlooking the sacrifice in the sacrament,† whose correlative it is, like gift and reciprocal gift, love and reciprocal

*In reference to the original sin it assumed, that it has already been blotted out by baptism into the death of Christ.

†Compare the exceedingly instructive paragraph in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, *Quid sit sacrificium et quæ sint sacrificii specie, p. 253 sqq. ed. Recheub.*

love, as were the fathers. But we, as evangelical Christians, exalt the sacrament as a Divine gift above the offering as a human gift, as we do the gospel above the law, or the love with which God has loved us, above that with which we love him (1 John 4 : 10) or as we exalt, in general, the Divine above the human.* What the nature of the sacrifice is, which connects itself with the sacrament, we will discuss hereafter. At present we will only show, that it is not an objective expiatory sacrifice or offering of works, by which God is first to be reconciled, his grace made efficient and his mercy acquired. This it cannot be, because it is already the greatest grace of the reconciled God, that the God-man gives himself to us in the earthly elements for our appropriation and partaking, that he administers to us his body and blood as a Divine food, and receives us into the communion of his gracious essence. His love which does nothing but give and forgive says not, bring and offer, but *take* and eat. To attempt to reconcile the gracious God by our gifts, and merit the inheritance of his grace by our works, where the hand, yea infinitely more than the hand, has already been extended from above for reconciliation, would be to abuse his condescending love, instead of gratefully accepting it. To change the pledge *to be received* into an offering *to be presented* would be to invert the sacrament; and to offer the testator his own testament would certainly be a perversion. It is true, the gifts we offer to God are his, but we do yet not offer them, before we have received them, and we moreover receive much more than we give. To mix both up together is to confound and weaken both, and to receive back the gift, at the moment of its bestowal, dishonors the giver. How unbecoming, therefore, must it appear, when the Father and the Son come to make their abode with us† (John 14 : 23), to send back the Son to the Father in heaven, as an expiatory offering, at the very moment, when he gives, or is about to give him to us! This is done in the canon of the mass, where immediately after the consecration the priest, instead of celebrating with the most humble gratitude the gracious presence and condescension of the All-merciful, rises and, "mindful not only of the blessed sufferings and resurrection, but also of the glorious ascension of Christ,

*This also is the sense of what the Lord says in Matt. 9 : 13, I will have mercy and not sacrifice.

†Compare Luther's Sermon on the New Testament, Walch Vol. XIX. p. 1355 ss.

offers to the glorious majesty of God a pure sacrifice of his presents and gifts, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate sacrifice,* the sacred bread of eternal life and the cup of constant salvation,† upon which God may graciously look and accept it, as he accepts the sacrifice of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedek." Consequently not one word of humble thanksgiving for the perfect gift which came from above, from the bosom of the Father, but only a presumptuous sending or lifting of it up to the Father,‡ in order to obtain for it the grace of his reconciliation and other benefits. What becomes of the eucharist, of the thanksgiving?

The thanksgiving for the high and holy gift bestowed upon us by grace is so essential in the Holy Supper, that it has received the appellation of eucharist in consequence, for which very reason it cannot be an expiatory sacrifice through which the gift of grace can first be acquired. It does not work out reconciliation for us, as an offering for works, but presents it to us as a sacrament; it does not merit it for us as a good work, but bequeathes it to us as a testament; it is not a reward for services rendered, but a marriage feast, by which the bridegroom espouses the bride, but in which he is not offered up by her. It cannot be an expiatory sacrifice because nothing of it is appropriated to God, but everything partakes of, and because it is bloodless like, a meat-offering, Lev. 3: 2, whilst, according to the Scriptures, the propitiation for the people is effected only through the shedding of blood and the suffering of death, Heb. 9: 11-22. The bloody suffering and death of Christ is the only perfect expiatory sacrifice, sufficient for every debt of sin; because it fulfils in

*How sublime soever these words may sound, their weight is diminished not only by the high sacrifice being put on the same level with human sacrifices (which can only be explained as typifying Christ's sacrifice), but also and chiefly because the wafer is already presented before the consecration, immediately after the commencement of the offertorium, as immaculate *hostia proinnumerabilibus peccatis*, &c., and the still unconsecrated cup as *pro nostra et totius mundi salute*. This proves only too truly how lightly the idea of the sacrifice of propitiation is treated and in what a scandalous manner they derogate from the merit of Christ's sacrifice, Compare O. & N. T. cultus, p. 239 ss.

†Both, *principaliter et finaliter* appointed for us as sacramental partaking, but not as expiatory offering to God.

‡According to Chemnitz Exam. Concil. Trident. P. II. loc. VI. Art. 4. Innocent III. explains de *sacre altaris mysterio* the term *missa* thus: *Sacrificium illud vocatur missa, quasi hostia a nobis transmissa Patri ut intercedat pro nobis ad ipsum.*

opposition to all pleasure and selfishness of sin, and in the deepest and most painful self-denial and the most perfect obedience of the love of the Son of God, the whole law of God, in the most perfect manner (Heb. 10 : 7-10), and through his merits satisfies all its requirements and cancels every one of its debts. It is finished in that awful depth of suffering, when the Son of man, suspended upon the accursed tree, felt himself forsaken of God and bowed his head, covered with wounds and blood, in sacrificial death. The Holy Supper, on the other hand, is no sacrificial suffering upon the bloody altar in the outer court, but a glorification as precious as it is holy, and a deeply mysterious importation of the life and love of Christ in the holy place. With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, says the Lord, Luke 22 : 15, and in John 13 : 31 he says, Now is the Son of man glorified and God is glorified in him. The feeding of his disciples with the essence of his flesh and blood is to him not painful, but an act of pleasure, just as it is to a mother a source not of suffering, but of delight, lovingly to nourish at her own breast the child which she has brought forth in sorrow. Such tender sacrifice of love and communications of life could never have atoned for the death and hell-deserving guilt of the world. If the reconciliation of a hostile world could have been effected in so tender and painless a manner, it would have been done. Since, however, this was not possible, it has been effected on the wood of torment, where Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, in that he became a *curse* for us, so that he might become for us a *blessing* in the Holy Supper, in which his awful sacrifice on the cross is glorified and communicated to and received by us with thankfulness, consolation and peace. There occurred the death of him who made the testament, Heb. 10 : 16 ; here the inheritance is distributed among the invited children. It is only to be received by those who have already before obtained absolution* in repentance and confession, accordingly by those who are already children and in a state of grace, and who are only to be nourished, strengthened and blessed in it by means of the essential bread of life. Hence the Holy Supper is celebrated rather by those who are already in a state of reconciliation (*reconciliatis*), than by those yet to be reconciled (*reconciliandis*) and is therefore a truly eucharistic, but not a truly propiti-

*Analogous to the washing of feet before the institution of the Holy Supper, John 13.

tory sacrifice. If, therefore, the Tridentium declares it to be the latter, and considers it identical with the sacrifice upon the cross, because the same Christ is present in both, the manner of presentation only being different (*sola offerendi ratio diversa*), it overlooks the fact, that notwithstanding this identity of the subject, it is nevertheless the different manner of presentation and administration which essentially distinguishes the propitiatory from the eucharistical sacrifice, as it does also from the sacrament. He is the same Christ on Easter, as on Good-Friday, the same on mount Tabor, as on Calvary. Yet he does not accomplish the expiatory sacrifice on the former, but on the latter, and, according as in his high-priestly office either the compassionate intercession or the communicating benediction, either the passion or the action predominates, so also is it determined, whether reconciliation is merited by it objectively in God, what only the death of the Lord on the cross accomplished; or whether the reconciliation already accomplished, and now offered, is thereby subjectively appropriated and received, which continually takes place in Christendom to the end of the world. To put the daily masses, performed by the priests, together with the great number of low masses by which, when celebrated without communion nothing is heard but the tinkling bell, (1 Cor. 13: 1,) on an equality with the sacrifice of Christ, which wrought out reconciliation for the whole world, as *sacrificia vere propitiatoria*, is nothing less than an ungrateful misapprehension of its great importance and peculiar unparalleled painful signification, and an extreme mystification of the true Evangelical design and value of the Holy Supper. An outright denial of this is but a poor argument, and to maintain in opposition, that the benefits of the sacrifice on the cross are most abundantly received through the mass,* is in reality nothing more than to allow the propitiatory character, which has been asserted for the latter again to disappear in the sacramental, and confounds the distinction. Yet it serves nevertheless as a witness, as those also do who depart from the truth, but who must notwithstanding more or less do honor to it. Here also pertain all the more ancient† and more recent modifications, by which the attempt is made to subsume and subordi-

**Oblationis cruentæ fructus per incruentam, uberrimo percipiuntur, tantum abest, ut ille per hanc quovis modo derogetur.* Conc. Trident. Sess. XXII. c. 5.

†Compare Chemnitz Exan. Conc. Trident P. II. loc. 6, de missa art. 4.

nate the propitiatory value of the sacrifice of the mass to the sacrifice of Christ, by regarding it as an iterated representation (presentation,) or as a continuation,* or as an antitypical commemoration offering,† or also as our presentation of that which Christ has offered for us on the cross. All this might be admitted in its proper place and in the sense of *faith* without trust in our own works, if the sacrifice on the cross would only always be recognized as the *one principal design of the sacrament of communion*, or as the gracious communication of the communion of Jesus, our mediator and propitiatory sacrifice, and that consequently the chief benefit to be derived from it is also to be adjudged to those only, who believingly receive it, and not to do or have it offered as meritorious work, either for ourselves or others, be they living or dead, which would be utterly useless.

According to this it is evident, that the Holy Supper is in its principal design not an expiatory sacrifice, through which man reconciles God to himself, but a sacrament or *sacramental feast* through which God forms a reconciliatory union with man and graciously imparts to him the righteousness and essential communion of Christ. From this it does, however, by no means follow, that the sacrament is altogether without sacrifice. This is a modern and one-sided view and differs decidedly from our Confession. As sacrifices in gen-

*This is the view held by Möhler in his Symbolic § 34, (doctrine on the mass,) where he counts the Lord's "perpetual condescension to our infirmity in the eucharist, as part of that one mighty action undertaken out of love for us and expiatory of our sins."

†To this also amounts the view of the Irwingites, who connect the "sacramental offering" with the heavenly intercession which the Lord makes for us, but in so doing treat too slightly the sacramental communion; Comp. Rothe on the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ on the cross, and the sacrifice of the Church in the holy sacrament of the altar, Frankf. and Erlangen 2. Ed. 1854. The communion is regarded not as the end and object, but only as an appendix to the sacrificial service and only in a legal manner as a "performance of the command of the Lord, take and eat." p. 26. The critical examination of the reformatorial doctrine is exceedingly poor and ignores entirely the decision of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession regarding sacrament and sacrifice, as well as Luther's opinion, who distinctly declares (W, vol. XIII. p. 704, in a sermon on Maundy-Thursd.) that the Supper is in more respects than one also a *sacrifice*, an opinion with which Chemnitz and other respectable theologians of our church fully agree, without, however, conceding anything that might be prejudicial to the essence of the sacrament and the gospel, as is unfortunately the case on the part of the Irwingites, in whose liturgies the sacramental everywhere gives way to the sacrificial, and the evangelical to the legal.

eral have a sacramental (consecrating) aspect, so also have sacraments a sacrificial aspect; and as the Holy Supper is based on Christ's self-sacrifice, so also is its sacramental consecration and administration preceded by an offertory sacrifice of consecration and prayer, to be accompanied and followed by eucharistic offerings of praise and thanksgiving.* Its celebration is introduced as an offertory by furnishing the table with the provision of bread and wine. To suffer this, however, to be done apart by the sexton without prayer, is not becoming.† The bringing forth of the bread and wine over which the solemnly wonderful blessing (*eulogia*) of the highest is to spread itself, the consecrating presentation of the temporal gifts (*προσφορά*), that the perfect gift from above may come upon them, the placing of these visible elements of the holy sacrament of the covenant upon the altar of incense (prayer) before the All-holy, is an act far too full of meaning and too significant to be left to the mute door-keeper, or sexton of the church. Not that we for ourselves would exalt these trifling gifts, this humble meat and drink offering, or ascribe to it some merit or expiatory virtue, as is unfortunately done in the Romish mass, which pompously lifts up to God the simple bread before the *offertorium* and before it is yet body and blood of Christ, as an *immaculate sacrifice for innumerable sins*, and the simple wine cup *for the salvation of the whole world*. Far be such an idle, empty conceit from us! It is rather our poverty, the small earthly element, the substance of our creature essence (the sighing creation,) which we poor sinners present in all humility and penitence, grateful to the Father for the merciful gifts of our daily bread and, at the same time, beseeching him in the name of the Son, that the heavenly bread of eternal life may unite itself to the temporal bread, so that it may become to us, through divine communication, the holy body of Christ, which is given for our redemption and constitutes the Church's everlasting food.‡

*Compare Harach's *der Christliche Gemeinde Gottesdienst*, 254 ss. and 391 s.

†Luther (W. vol. X. p. 2757,) is in favor of having it done during the *Patrem*, i. e. during the repetition of the Creed.

‡Compare Kahnis, *doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, Leipzig, 1851, p. 34. The consecration, which in the Supper is pronounced over the elements, concerns the whole natural life, *the groaning creation* which as the ancient Church-fathers so successfully maintained against the Gnostics, comes from the same God, who gave us Christ, as our Saviour.

After this presentation, and after the words of institution, which put us in mind that our hearts are to be lifted up, have been pronounced, the approach of the Lord is celebrated by singing the holy, holy, holy of the angels, who come with him, and the Advent anthem, Blessed be he that cometh, &c., &c. Hereupon let his holy testament be published in his presence and amid the surroundings of such a cloud of witnesses, and as he speaks, so it is done, and as he commands, so it stands fast. As under the old covenant it was not an unfrequent occurrence, that the glory of the Lord descended in the cloud of fire and spirit upon the sacrifice, glorifying it, thus it also glorifies itself here, whilst descending in blessing upon the gifts of bread and wine, and exalting them to the communion of the body and blood of Christ. Now is the Son of man ever again glorified in his Supper, and God is glorified in him, invisibly and mysteriously, it is true, yet really and evidently according to his word. O how glorious is the mystery,* of this glorification of Jesus in the bread and wine of the New Testament through the condescension of his majesty! How sublime, how adorable appears the God-man in the humility of his love, in which he gives himself to his disciples under these insignificant earthly forms! Surely now must also ascend to him *eucharistic* praise and thanks-offering of faith and love; the *praise-offering of faith*, which in remembrance, both of the sacrificial sufferings as well as of the glorification of Christ at the right hand of the Father, where he makes intercession for us, extols his glory and lays hold of the benefits of his grace and trusts in God, in virtue of the power of his sacrifice; and the *thank-offering of love*, which returns the gift of the highest good it has received, by the penitent and believing surrender of the grateful heart and the will, and the consecration of the body which has been fed with the body of Christ, for sacrifice, which is living, holy and acceptable to God, Rom. 12: 1; 1 Peter 2: 5. Since now love is the bond of perfection, which unites God and man, and men and Christians among each other into the body of Christ, so also is doubtless continually taking place in the celebration of the communion a renewal of the new

*The appellation *tremendum mysterium* given to it, refers to what Augustine so beautifully styles the horror honoris et tremor amoris, but not to that fear and trembling which was experienced at the foot of Mount Sinai and which according to Heb. 12: 18 ss. is banished from the Gospel.

covenant of grace and love, based upon the blood of Christ which evinces itself just as much on the side of God in the sacramental feast, as it does on the side of man in the sacrificial rendering of gifts and works of love, as well as in prayers and intercessions, in the name of Christ, for the Church, for all divine institutions and for all men, as prescribed by Paul with an express reference to Christ offered for us, 1 Tim. 3,* Paul also refers 1 Cor. 10: 16 s., to such a celebration of the covenant, typified in Exod. 24, where he, after designating the bread which we break, as the communion of the body of Christ, says of the same bread, *for we being many are one bread and one body* (namely, the body of Christ, Rom. 12: 5), *for we are all partakers of that one bread*, and then cautions against all and every participation in heathen sacrificial feasts, because they place us in the same essential communion with the sacrificial subjects and objects of their altars, in which the Holy Supper places us with Christ, 1 Cor. 11: 18-21. Sacrifices of love in good works are especially recommended, (Heb. 10: 24; and 13: 15) in connection with the communion cultus, and in the same place, immediately preceding, is also specially mentioned the sacrifice of praise, or of confession, or of commemoration, which is equally required in the words of our Lord, *do this in remembrance of me*, and in the words of Paul, 1 Cor. 11: 26, *as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come*. To this points already prophetically the hymn connected with the Passover, Matt. 26: 30, the prophecy of Malachi 1: 11, concerning the universal meat and memorial offering to the name of the Lord† as well as the entire eucharistic cultus communicated to the seer of the Apocalypse, which the congregation above with which we are in communion (Heb. 12: 22-24), offers to the Lamb that was slain for us Rev. 4 and 5; Heb. 12: 22 ss. Hence also it is both right and proper to remember this assembly above in the liturgy of the Holy Supper‡

*The custom, according to the ancient liturgies, of repeating the Lord's Prayer, together with "O Lamb of God," &c., serves as a precedent.

†The meat offerings were also memorial offerings, See Lev. 2: 2, 9, 16.

‡Chemnitz (Exam. Conc. Trid. p. II. loc. 6 *de missa pontificia* sect. 3) designates it as *verba pulcherrima in Canone: Nobis quoque*

(d) Concerning the cup.

Thus then the fellowship of Christians in worship and prayer, or their celebration of the communion, which is at once sacramental and sacrificial, centres in the presence of the Lord at his table; it concentrates itself around the consecrated bread which is the communion of the body of Christ which was given for us, around the bread which we break, i. e. communicate or distribute* (Acts 2 : 42-46 s.) as the pledge and bond of essential communion with him and through him with one another.

But it concentrates itself no less around the *consecrated cup*, of which we have thus far already incidentally spoken in connection with the bread, but which we must now more especially consider, because the words of the institution also say some things especially concerning it. These correspond nearer with those used by Matt. 26 : 27 s. and Mark 14 : 23 s. in reference to the bread, inasmuch as according to both, it is said of the cup or its contents, *this is my blood*, to which in both is added, *of the New Testament, which is shed for many*, and by Matthew in particular, *for the remission of sins*. In Luke 22 : 20 and Paul, 1 Cor. 11 : 25 it is said of the cup itself, *this cup is the New Testament in my blood, &c.* In all the four texts of the testamentary words of institution in regard to the cup, the *καὶν διαθήκη* is prominently mentioned as consummated in the shedding and appropriation of the blood of Christ. The peculiar character of this New Testament or covenant may be best inferred from 2 Cor. 3 : 6 ss. and Heb. 9 : 11 ss. where a comparison between both Testaments is instituted, and where in the latter passage special mention is also made of the blood of the Old (Exod. 24 : 8) and new covenant. The old covenant is that

peccatoribus, famulis tuis, de multitudine miserationum tuarum sperantibus, partem aliquam et societatem dare digneris cum sanctis tuis, inter quorum nos consortium non estimator meriti, sed veniæ quæsumus largitor admittes, per Christum dominum nostrum. On the other hand he characterizes the invocation of, and the appeal to, the merits of the saints as *abominatio*.

*As regards the breaking of bread I can only conform to the mode of Dr. Harnack in his "Christlicher Gemeindegottesdienst im apostolischen und altkatholischen Zeitalter, Erlangen 1854, p. 173 ss., who in conformity with the older Lutheran Theologians refers to it first and foremost to the *distribution* which is very important in the communion, without, however, ascribing to it any essential and sacrificial signification. I also appeal to the deductions of that learned man, given before and after that passage, in reference to the Holy Supper in the Apostolic age, in confirmation of my own.

of the law which imparts a knowledge of sin, requires the righteousness of works, preaches condemnation to the guilty and effects by the blood of its imperfect and typical sacrifices only an imperfect and never sufficient atonement, and must, consequently, be continually repeated. The new covenant, on the contrary, is that of the *Gospel*, which proclaims grace, satisfies the law on our behalf with the righteousness of Christ, promises in his holy name the entire forgiveness of sin or justification and, through the perfect sacrifice of his blood shed but once upon the cross, makes a complete atonement for all our debt of sin. That Jesus Christ, the only mediator between God and man and the high-priest of the New Testament, has finished his work and sacrifice fully in the sight of God, is the doctrine distinctly set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews. All that yet remains is, that this covenant of grace be carried into effect in us *men*, by having the instrument of union, which is the atoning and sanctifying blood of Christ, appropriated to us, our whole being touched by it, our hearts sprinkled with it (Heb. 10 : 22 ; 12 : 24), and thus the whole man made partaker with the essence of his Mediator in reconciliation and united with him in that righteousness which is acceptable to God, and which gives life and salvation. This is effected in the covenantal celebration of the holy communion, within the Zion of the New Testament, analagous to the covenantal celebration of the Old Testament at Mount Sinai, Exod. 24 : 8. Here the blood of the sacrifice was no longer offered to God sacrificially, but rather applied to the congregation sacramentally, for Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, behold this is the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you (comp. Heb. 9 : 19, 20), whereupon here also a holy feast followed (Exod. 24 : 11). In the Holy Supper such an external sprinkling with "scarlet wool and hyssop" does not take place, but the lips of the communicant are moistened, (Isaiah 6 : 7), by means of the cup, with the blood of the New Testament, and with it *his own* blood and heart are internally affected by it, an occurrence, which is so much the less to be regarded as incredible, because the drinking of simple wine produces not only physical, but also psychical effects, in as much as it maketh glad the heart of man, Ps. 104 : 15. What a blessing, what grace for all who are called to the assembly and Church of the first-born, (Heb. 12 : 22-24), thus to be sprinkled and refreshed with the glorified blood of Christ, with the

blood of the New Testament of reconciliation, and in this way to become so heartily assured of perfect pardon and reconciliation and so firmly and confidently fixed in the peace of God and the Lamb, by whose wounds we are healed ! Hence the emphasis laid upon the words, *for the forgiveness of sin*, by Matthew when he speaks of the cup. Surely it is a glorious privilege and sacred duty of the ministry of the New Testament to whom is committed the word of reconciliation, so also to confirm and establish it by the presentation of the cup with the blood of the new covenant ; and certainly with this duty corresponds the inalienable *right* of every member of the covenant people to this covenant cup which as such is itself according to Luke and Paul the *new covenant in the blood of Christ*. How sacred and full of salvation, therefore, is this cup and how worthily glorifies itself in it also the gracious presence of the Lord, whose life-blood is a life-giving drink indeed, John 6 : 53-56. To withhold it from the laity, for whom the Lord has designed it, or, having designed it for *all* (Matt. 26 : 27) to withhold it from individual souls, can be regarded in no other light than that of a gross wrong, and no other apology is to be offered in extenuation of it, except that which our Saviour offered in extenuation of the crimes committed by those who crucified him, namely, they know not what they do.

Yet it is nevertheless an act of the highest presumption to declare the cup, which the Lord in his testament has so solemnly and in language so distinctly referring to it instituted for all, as superfluous, and withhold it at the communion from communicants. Even though the two elements in the sacrament were as similar as are the two eyes in a man's face, it would be equally as unjust to set one of them aside, as to remove one of these eyes, because he sees with both the same things. Hence the assumption of the concomitancy, according to which the whole Christ is present in both forms, namely, the blood equally in the body, and the body equally in the blood, and that, consequently, the same gift would be doubly received, can not at all justify the mutilation of the sacrament and the withholding of it from the communicants for whom the two-fold gift of God is reduced to *one*. But it can not on any account, be conceded, that the two forms of the sacrament which are externally so very different, should internally be so entirely the same, that the withdrawal of the second would not involve the loss of anything essential to the Christian. It is true that the whole Christ is person-

ally present at his table, as has been sufficiently shown above, and does not communicate himself in two presences, the one of his body and the other of his blood, which are not to be considered as abstract essences. Yet it must also be allowed in deference to the word and meaning of the Lord, that the one essential presence of the God-man exercises a diverse influence on the two diverse elements of his sacrament. The mysteries of the most holy love, with which we have to deal here in humble devotion, are exceedingly delicate; but not so darkly mysterious as to prevent us from distinguishing anything in them, although the word of the Lord distinguishes both forms (*species*) of his communication specifically and mentions previously in addition to the meat also the drink of eternal life. John 6: 53. Hence he does by no means permit us to make both resemble each other so closely (as for instance one breast of a mother resembles another) that it would be altogether a matter of indifference whether we received only one and dispensed entirely with the other. But in what the different influences consist which the present Christ exerts upon the bread, which is the communion of his body, and upon the wine, which is the communion of his blood, this we cannot discern with our senses, but only guess at it by supposing, that the influence upon the bread which is more of a substantial nature, is nourishing, and that upon the wine which is more of an essential nature, is invigorating, or that the first exerts more of a somatically binding and uniting and the latter more of a psychically refreshing and purifying influence upon the participants, the one satisfying more the hungering, and the other more the thirsting of the soul (Matt. 5: 6,) after God and his peace in Christ, who is himself our peace. Eph. 2: 14. The living blood is according to the view of the holy Scriptures the internal higher vital power of the body, the current of life within it, the seat of motion or support of the animating soul (ψυχή, *anima*). In as much as the life and soul of the body is in the blood, Lev. 17: 11,) the *expiatory* virtue of the sacrifice is consequently also less ascribed to the death of the body, than to the shedding of the blood and to its application by sprinkling. Heb. 9: 22. This is especially the case in v. 12 ss. of the same chapter and in other passages of the New Testament, where the blood of Christ is chiefly spoken of as possessing the propitiatory, redeeming and purifying efficacy, for which reason it is also denominated in the testamentary words of the Lord *the blood of the New Testament* or cove-

nant which is shed for *the remission of sin*, whilst the consecrated cup itself is called the new covenant in his blood, because it binds and concludes the covenant in the blood of Christ to the communicants.* Hence it must assuredly also have its special signification and peculiar higher value as a most cogent *pledge* and *vivifying bond of love* of a perfect reconciliation with God in Christ, and must on no account be treated as inferior to the bread, or be altogether dispensed with at the communion, as is presumptuously done by the Romish church.† Though it be but a man's testament, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto, Gal. 3: 15, and the testament of the Lord, after it has become of force through his death, Heb. 9: 17, should not be permitted to be abridged and mutilated by those to whom he has committed its execution and by them delivered to his heirs in this mangled condition. Never has the church, which is to be subject to Christ as the faithful wife is subject to her husband, (Eph. 5: 24,) received such a permission, and dare not, therefore, stunt or abridge, in violation of the testament, the heritage of the children, under any pretext whatever. The evangelic orthodox church holds with unshaken firmness to the whole of the sacred testament of her Lord and heavenly high-priest, who has faithfully promised and secured to her his real mediatorial presence, and its manifestation and gracious communication in the Holy Supper. She recognizes in it with fervent praise and devout gratitude a deep condescending and softly veiled appearance of his glory on earth in organic connection with the entire manifestation and glorification of God in the flesh, a shekinah full of grace and truth, John 1: 14.

(e) Concerning Christ's sayings uttered in connection with the institution of the Holy Supper.

*It takes in a certain sense the place of the blood-sprinkled on the Kaporeth of the ark of the covenant of the O. T. That, moreover the cup of the N. T. in the blood of Christ cannot merely be filled with wine, which only signifies, but is not wine, is incontrovertibly evident, for in that case it would not be what it is, but only a shadow of it.

†If in Acts 2: 42, &c., the Lord's Supper is designated simply by the mention of the *breaking of bread*, it as little excludes the cup at the communion, as eating in general excludes drinking. In the same way does, according to 1 John 5: 6, the coming of Christ with his *blood* not exclude his coming with his body. The body and blood of Christ nourish and increase, as living pledges of love, not only justifying *faith*, but also sanctifying love and the blessed hope of a future glorification. For where there is forgiveness of sin, there also are life and salvation, and conversely.

The entire gospel, as well as the 1 Epistle of John, is permeated with the manifestation of the divine glory in the essence of the Son of Man; but more especially is this the case with the discourses and sacerdotal prayer of Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed. From the moment when he, who had just washed his disciples' feet, declared, Now is the Son of man glorified and God is glorified in him, from that moment are shining forth from the betrayed the rays of Divine greatness as sublime as they are mild. How sublime and, at the same time, how full of tenderness is his conversation with his disciples, as recorded to the end of chapter 14. A fearful prospect is awaiting him and them; yet he, attesting his divinity, speaks comfortably to them: *Let not your heart be troubled, if ye believe in God, ye also believe in me; and further on, I go to prepare a place for you. I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.* These words about his going away and coming again, so full of promise and uttered immediately after he had established, in the institution of the Holy Supper, a memorial of his name, in order in it to come to us and bless us, (Exod. 20 : 24,) and to take us to himself into the communion of his essence, give to us a new and weighty testimony of his essential presence as in heaven so on earth, in his church and his sacrament. And the succeeding declaration, I am, the way, the truth and the life, the true and living way, (Heb. 10 : 20,) proves again that his way-preparing, i. e. mediatorial presence is like Jacob's ladder, reaching from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth and, here especially, where Bethel stands on consecrated ground. Gen. 28 : 17-19. After this comes Philip's request: *Lord show us the Father, and it sufficeth us,* which is followed by the gracious and sublime answer: *Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.* O! truly a blessed recognition and beholding of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ, (2 Cor. 4 : 6,) was permitted to the disciple. We cannot think of it without feeling that awe of reverence and tremor of love, (*horror honoris et tremor amoris*) which is also experienced by believing communicants at the holy communion. The succeeding encouragements to prayer in his name, together with the promise that it shall be answered, that the Father may be honored in the Son, as well as the promise of his coming with the Father and the sending of the Holy Ghost and the giving of his peace, all give evidence how

infinitely the Son of man is glorified in God and God in him, and with what profound truth he can and does realize the word of his more than maternal compassion surely and especially in the sacrament, *I will not leave you orphans, I will come to you.* He it is, who comes by water and blood, Jesus Christ, and with him comes the Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son and beareth witness. 1 John 5: 6.

According to the first three Evangelists the Lord connects with his Supper this farewell of his visible communion at the table with his disciples, *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.* Then, after the meal had been concluded, (John 14: 21,) follow, in intimate connection, the words of the Lord concerning himself as the true vine, John 13: 1ss. affording very striking evidence, how the discontinuance of his visible communion did not only not abolish the essential union with him, but how it must, in actual organical connection, like that between the vine and its branches, always endure and establish itself continually anew in a reciprocal covenant of love. When Christ calls himself the true (consequently not merely figurative) vine and his Father the husbandman, who raises the branches on him, it is beyond all doubt, that the Son does not indicate himself as the vine according to his purely human nature, according to which we are not his branches, but according to his divine-human essence, according to which we are one substance with him. The vine, which sustains us as branches, can certainly not be transplanted into heaven merely to grow only there, but must also flourish on earth and nourish us with the sap and vigor of its essence, because we, if separated from it, would soon wither and grow cold in love and die. John 15: 6. As he loves us, and, therefore, also abides in us, so also are we again to love him and one another, and abide in him and permit nothing to separate us from his love and presence. Such a union, continually nurtured and renewed through the holy communion, gives consolation, strength and fortitude in all afflictions, temptations and persecutions for the sake of the beloved, who also on that account predicts to his disciples after the Supper a participation in his sufferings. John 15: 18ss. But he promises to his disciples not only a participation in his sufferings, but also in his joys and glorification, (John 16) and gives to them finally

the assurance of his peace, which is based upon the glory of his victory over the world and its sorrow. John 16 : 33.

After all this follows the crowning consecratory act of that night of the first celebration of the Supper and the glorification of the Lord, that sacerdotal and most holy prayer, John 17, which is sustained by the consciousness of the primal glory of the Son with the Father, which he now prays to have also so gloriously glorified in his human nature, that his disciples may also participate in it, and be eternally united with the Father through him, the Mediator and high-priest of reconciliation, and of the glorification of God and men. The glory which thou gavest me I have given them, he says in verse 22 ss. that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in me; and that the world may know, that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Worthy of thanks and adoration appear, in this sublime conversation of the Son with the Father, both the divine majesty and the compassionate love of the Son of man, with which he communicates his glory to those who believe in him, and in whom he dwells as in the temple of his body, in which the holy communion is celebrated with him to the end of the world. Who is worthy, who is able to praise his glory as it deserves and sufficiently to magnify him, the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, the good Shepherd and the holy Lamb, the bread of eternal life, our Saviour Jesus!

*Lauda Sion Salvatorem,
Lauda ducem et pastorem
Cum hymnis et canticis.
Quantum potes, tantum aude
Quia major omni laude,
Nec laudare sufficit.*

ARTICLE IV.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF FASTING.

By Rev. M. Valentine, A. M., Reading, Pa.

Captious Scribes and Pharisees come to Christ with the inquiry, Why His disciples are not found *Fasting*, like

VOL. XV, No. 58. 15

themselves and the disciples of John. The reply is a beautiful explanation of their non-observance of any such service at that time, and an explicit statement of a fact that should appear in all future ages of the Christian Church: "Can ye make the children of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days." Luke 5: 34-35. "Those days" soon came to the Church, they continue yet, and will, till Christ shall come again. If, as amid marriage festivities, His disciples were excused from fasting, whilst enjoying his personal presence, are we not to expect it now that He has "gone away?" Has not the Redeemer announced fasting as a characteristic of his followers? The object of this article is, to recall the Scripture doctrine in regard to this part of Christian service.

I. *Fasting is a Christian Service.* It is recognized as a part of the believer's proper practice. It belongs to the Christian life, endorsed in the Scriptures as an acceptable and profitable service. From some cause or other, there is but little practical acknowledgment of this truth, in a large portion of the Church of the present day. Fasting has fallen into general disesteem and disuse. With some it has become the custom to deny it any place among proper and scriptural services. They speak of it as a thing, belonging only to a former and superseded dispensation. They class its observance among the superstitions, which the progress of the present day has not yet fully thrown off. A sad illustration of this may be seen in the rationalistic article on "Fasts" in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. The author of the article, Dr. J. R. Beard, speaks of it as having had "its origin in false and heathen conceptions," as being rather endured than approved by Moses, among the chosen people, and as being entirely disapproved by Christ in the Christian Church. It is held up as a superstition, unworthy of any place in the Christian's regard or practice. The rationalism of those who profess the "liberal Christianity" of our times, is largely imbued with this sentiment. With some others, who do not go so far as to discard it as a relic of ignorance and superstitious misconception, there is, however, a strong prejudice against fasting, from its perversion and abuse in the Romish Church and elsewhere. The bald formality and hypocrisy of the service, in many cases, have produced a feeling of aversion to the whole thing. Fasting

to discriminate between true fasting, and the corruptions *men* have introduced into it, and the abuses they have associated with it, many depreciate the entire external act, and attempt to *spiritualize* all allusions which the Scriptures make to it as a Christian duty. And even where its propriety is admitted, it is often assigned but little importance, and its practice either never or seldom appears among the exercises of their piety. It is true, indeed, that the theoretical and expository discussions of nearly all of our most eminent theologians give fasting some place among Christian services; yet in the practical piety of the Church, it is, beyond disguise, but little esteemed and less observed. Few features of Bible piety are less alluded to in the pulpit; no service, perhaps, is more neglected. Looking at the prevalent sentiment and practice of the Church, and making a comparison of them with the prominence given to fasting in the Holy Scriptures, we can hardly resist the conviction that there has been some departure from the truth, as once held by the saints. But that this service is not to be placed among the superseded observances of a past dispensation, nor among the asceticisms of a rude age, nor among the indifferent and useless things of theological doctrine, worthy of general neglect, is plainly apparent in the light of the divine teaching.

1. For proof, we turn first to the Old Testament. The Jewish Church was not a different Church from the Christian, but the same under a preparatory dispensation and earlier development. It embodied the truth of God, and represented the piety, acceptable to Him. It is impossible to overlook the prominence of fasting in the divinely sanctioned religion of that dispensation. It was woven into the common practice of the pious.

Nothing is said of fasting among the Patriarchs. Yet it is probable that they observed it, as may be judged from the fact that when first instituted, among the required acts of piety, Lev. 16 : 29 ; 23 : 27-29, it appears to be mentioned as no new institution, but as an old and well-known practice. But beginning with Moses we have constant records of it. When he entered the Mount, to receive the Law, and commune with God, he abstained from food, forty days. This must have been by divine direction and miraculous aid. There was but one *stated, regularly recurring Fast*, ordained in the Jewish Church. This was on the great day of annual atonement, when the sins of the people were brought special-

ly to mind. This observance was so prominent, that the occasion obtained the simple designation of "The Fast," Acts 27: 9. It was surely by divine authority, that fasting was made a part of the high solemnities of the day of atonement. Special public fasts were frequently appointed and observed. Joshua and the Elders of Israel when defeated by the men of Ai, kept a fast, and remained prostrate before the ark from morning to evening. Josh. 7: 6. When unsuccessful, on several occasions, in the war against Benjamin, "*The children of Israel*, and all the people, went up and came unto the House of God, and wept, and *fasted* that day until even, and offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord," Judges 20: 26. The Israelites, pressed by the Philistines, assembled in penitence "before the Lord at Mizpeh, and fasted that day there, and said, We have sinned against the Lord." 1 Sam. 7: 6. Assailed by the confederate forces of Ammon and Moab, Jehoshaphat appointed a day of fasting and prayer throughout the kingdom. 2 Chron. 20: 3. While yet in Babylon, Nehemiah set apart a season of special prayer, accompanied with fasting, on account of the desolations of the city and people of God; and afterward, when he came to Jerusalem, he proclaimed a public and solemn fast, to deplore the low state of religion, and to pray for pardoning and restoring mercy. Neh. 1: 4; 9: 1. When, from the conspiracy of Haman, perils closed around Queen Esther and her people, she set apart three days, as a season of solemn prayer and abstinence from food, and all the Jews in Shushan united in the fast. Esther 4: 16. When Ezra was about to set out on his important mission to Jerusalem, he assembled the returning captives at the river Abava, and there "proclaimed a fast, that they might afflict themselves before God, and seek for Him a right way for themselves, and their little ones, and for all their substance," Ezra 8: 21. In a day of great political and moral desolation, God's direction to Judah by the mouth of His prophet, was, "Sanctify a fast; call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land unto the house of the Lord, your God, and cry unto the Lord," Joel 1: 14. "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly; gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, * * let the bridegroom go forth out of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O

Lord, and give not thy heritage to reproach," Joel 2: 15-17. Even the heathen inhabitants of Nineveh, in view of threatened judgments, proclaimed a season of humiliation and prayer, in which all, from the oldest to the youngest, were required to abstain from food," Jonah 3: 5. Now it must be remembered that God sanctioned these services of public fasting, by His manifest blessing. This is a fact of much significance. The armies of Joshua became thenceforward victorious. The children of Israel were no longer smitten before Benjamin. They discomfited the Philistines at Mizpeh. The leagued strength of Ammon and Moab was broken by Jehoshaphat. To Nehemiah was given the privilege of seeing the desolations of the city and people of God disappear before the fervor and activity of a revived piety. Esther and her people experienced a most signal deliverance. Ezra realized the blessing which he sought with such humble importunity. The flood-tide of judgment was rolled back from even the guilty inhabitants of Nineveh. And on compliance with the prophet's call, there was waiting the promise of abundant blessings.

In addition to these facts which were, now and then, observed, as prompted by casual occurrences, there were several general public fasts which the people were accustomed to celebrate, at fixed times, every successive year. One was kept on the ninth day of the fifth month, in mournful commemoration of the burning of the holy city by Nebuzaradan, 2 Kings 25: 8-11; Jer. 52: 12; Zech. 7: 3-5; 8: 19. Another was observed in the seventh month, as an expression of sorrow for the murder of Gedaliah at Mizpeh, Jer. 41: 1-2. And a third was held on the tenth day of the tenth month, to commemorate the commencement of the dread siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, 2 Kings 25: 1; Zech. 8: 19.

But there was also private fasting. It was the frequent personal practice of devout and eminent leaders of the Jewish church. Of their own accord, whenever their feelings and judgment so prompted, they resorted to it, in connection with prayer, as a holy, acceptable and profitable service. Of this service by Moses, when he ascended Sinai to receive from God the institutes of religion, and returned with the splendor of an angel radiating from his face, we have already been reminded. The wonderful Elijah, approved of God by the marvel of translation, fasted, like Moses, on one occasion,

forty days and forty nights. David fasted, as well as prayed, during the illness of his child. Assailed by his enemies, he says, in one of his Psalms, "I humbled my soul with fasting and prayer," 35: 13. And in affliction, he declares, "I wept and chastened my soul with fasting," Ps. 69: 10. Daniel, oppressed with a view of the desolations of Zion, set his face to seek God "by prayer and supplications with fasting," Dan. 9: 3, and about to receive a special communication relative to the destiny of the Church, he spent three weeks in partial fasting, denying himself luxurious living and accompanying his fervent devotions with abstinence from all pleasant food, 10: 2-3. And what do these examples disclose? Certainly, that fasting, as an auxiliary to prayer and humiliation, occupied a high place in the esteem and practice of the approved saints of God, of old. Multiplied incidental expressions abound in the Old Testament which show that it was common. And though God sometimes rebuked the abuse and perversion of the external practice, just as he reproved the perversion of *many* of his most sacred ordinances, He yet manifested abundant favor toward it, whenever performed in the true spirit of devotion and obedience. This is incontrovertible. So undeniable, indeed, is it, that even Dr. Cumming, whose prejudices lead him to discountenance all literal and actual fasting as a religious service, is compelled to make the admission, "Though it is not a divine prescription, it is yet unquestionable, that in almost every instance of fervent piety, and especially of public prayer, fasting was observed. *Vide* Lect. on Dan. p. 286. The truth, as thus far made clear, is that fasting was a service appointed, and approved of God, in the Old Testament dispensation. The light of this fact illumines the path of further examination.

2. And now we turn to the New Testament. This is final law for us as Christians. Does it disapprove of fasting, or whisper the first intimation that it is to pass away, and have no place in Christian life?

Opening the Gospel, one of its first scenes, in which the Holy Jesus appears as the center, is portrayed with a high and beautiful commendation of the piety of Anna, the prophetess, who "served God day and night with *fastings and prayers*" in the temple. Luke 2: 36, 37. Next we behold *Jesus Christ himself*, forever the great exemplar for His people, entering on his public ministry after a long season of fasting in the wilderness. That fast, though miraculous, ac-

knowledge and held forth the general principle involved. His fasting was not Jewish or ceremonial; for it obeyed no law of Moses. It was in the highest degree a spiritual service. In confronting the powers of temptation, he nerved his soul by retiring from the carnal and material into the spiritual, and withdrawing from feeding on "bread alone" to the exclusive use of the words which proceed out of the mouth of God. As the infallible Teacher, in his sermon on the mount, Christ has given a high endorsement of fasting, associating it with alms-giving and prayer. The Pharisees had corrupted and perverted all three of these services. Our Lord corrects the abuses in all, and treats all in the same way. He rescues all alike from the uses of hypocrisy. Speaking to his disciples, He had just said, "But *thou* when *thou* doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth"; "But *thou* when *thou* prayest, enter into thy closet." He does not command or forbid prayer or alms-giving, but takes for granted that Christians will do both. Just so with fasting: "When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites;"—"But *thou*, when *thou* fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face, that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which seeth in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." This *assumes* that Christians will fast, and prescribes the way and spirit of the service, to be acceptable. He directs *how* his disciples are to engage in the service, so as to secure a *reward from the Father*. Surely this cannot be claimed as a discouragement to fasting. If His correction of abuses, has not prohibited prayer and alms in the Christian church, it certainly cannot be regarded as disapproving of fasting. On the contrary, if His language is to be understood as endorsing the former, it must be held as likewise endorsing the latter. It is an implication so clear, as to amount almost to the force of a positive institute, that fasting is to be held as a permanent feature of the piety of the New Testament, as it had been of that of the Old. In harmony with this, is the declaration made by Christ, in connection with his explanation of the reason why his disciples did not fast whilst he was with them; "The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days." Christ opposes this statement, as a *fact*, to the cavils of the Jews. Though his disciples fast not while He is present to their senses, when he is removed they will urge their way, by fasting, into closer spiritual communion with Him.

Exalting this exercise still higher, He announces that the greatest power with God is possible only through it: "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." Matt. 17: 21.

Looking now to the time referred to in the words, "When the bridegroom shall be taken away," we have a commentary on His words. Christian's did fast. Among the apostles and primitive disciples, we see the full and active continuance of this exercise in the Church. The reader of the Acts of the Apostles is struck by the frequency with which fasting is represented as the accompaniment of prayer. And the records of its observance associate it with the highest and most solemn aspects of Christian service. When Barnabas and Saul were to be separated to a special and important mission, "They *fasted* and *prayed* and laid their hands on them." Acts 13: 3. On another occasion, "When they had ordained them elders in every Church, and had prayed with *fasting*, they commended them to the Lord," Acts 14: 23. Is not our usual feasting in connection with ordination services variant from the spirit of apostolic practice? It was whilst the prophets and teachers in the Church at Antioch were "ministering to the Lord and *fasting*," that they received a message from the Holy Spirit. Acts 13: 1, 2. Cornelius, the Centurion, is mentioned with approval as a "devout man, and one that feared God. He testifies, "Four days ago, I was fasting until this hour." Peter fasted in connection with his praying on the house-top at Joppa, Acts 10: 9, 10, 30. Paul claims that he "approved himself" in "fastings," as well as in "labors," and "watchings," and "by pureness and knowledge," 2 Cor. 6: 4-6. And in 1 Cor. 7: 5, he calls to "*fasting* and prayer," in a manner that shows that he looked upon it as a permanent service of piety in the Christian Church.

Such is the teaching of the New Testament. Such was the practice of the apostolic Church, and primitive Christians. Surely it does not look as if there ought to be no fasting among the followers of Christ. Scripture points in the other direction. And so does the examples of those, who say to us, by divine inspiration, "Be ye followers of us."

This practice continued in the early Church. "The custom obtained, that most Christians occasionally and privately joined abstinence from their food with their prayers."

Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. Vol. I. p. 87. Neander states, that they were accustomed to fast either partially, or entirely; whilst devoting many separate days to self-examination and prayer, and dedicating their life anew to God. And he traces how, from the primitive freedom and spirituality of the service, there was a gradual departure which resulted in the obligatory, stated, and formal fasts of the Romish Church. Hist. of Chr. Rel. Vol. I. 293-300. The historical relations of scriptural fasting, are briefly given by Dr. E. N. Kirk, of Boston: "I believe all the Church's eminent men, of every communion, have been distinguished for this exercise. I do not remember any of any age, who considered it as obsolete or useless. Down to the time of the Reformation, no true Christian any more thought of neglecting fasting than prayer. After the Reformation, we find two classes: those who chose to confound the Romish abuse with the institution itself; and those who practiced it in primitive simplicity. And I repeat my impression, that the men, most eminent for piety, in every branch of the Protestant Church, used this means of grace."

The position of our Church is in entire harmony with this exhibition of Scripture doctrine. Art. XXVI. of the Augsburg Confession, where the subject is introduced in connection with "Diversity of Meats," endorses true fasting, while it condemns its perversion and abuse. The Confessors reject as unscriptural, and at variance with Christian freedom, the appointment of *stated ecclesiastical fasts*, whose observance is made *obligatory* on the consciences of men. They especially condemn the Romish teaching, "that grace must be merited by the observance of laws, by fasts, and by diversities of meats." They, however, teach that, "*Every Christian ought to restrain himself by bodily discipline as fasting and other exercise, in order to avoid giving any occasion to sin, but not to merit grace or make satisfaction for sins, by these works.*" "*Thus fasting is not rejected, but the making of a necessary service out of it, upon fixed days, and with particular meats, to the confusion of the consciences of men.*" Luther's Smaller Catechism gives an explicit approval in referring to the qualifications for a worthy reception of the Lord's Supper: "*Fasting and bodily preparation are indeed a good external discipline.*" Our Church has, therefore, accepted it as a truth, that fasting is sanctioned under the New Testament dispensation, and com-

mends its practice, when understood in its true intent, as promotive of the piety of believers. Following the example of her Lord, in His Sermon on the Mount, she vindicates it from abuse, and says to Christians, "When ye fast," do it not under the constraint of human regulations, or with any idea of meriting grace.*

II. *Its Nature. What is Fasting as a religious service.*

1. We will fail to obtain a true conception of it, unless we recognize its intensely spiritual nature. Far removed from mere formality, it is an act of a truly earnest and deeply exercised soul. It has, however, an external part. There must be actual abstinence from food, either partially or entirely, during the season of fasting. This is unquestionably the Scripture pattern. The best internal devotional frame alone, is not fasting. We search in vain for any thing in the Bible, that looks like the notion that we can fulfil the duty in question, merely "in spirit." Some have spoken of the service as fulfilled in humble and careful abstinence from sin. But abstinence from sin, is a constant duty, whether we eat or drink or whatever we do. It is palpable wresting of all the precepts and examples of the Word of God on the subject to claim that in fasting, we can drop the actual abstinence, and yet fulfil the thing. We cannot do it, any more than we can partake of the Lord's Supper only in spirit, or "give alms" only in spirit. But while abstinence from food is an essential part of Scriptural fasting, the degree of that abstinence must be left to the judgment and conscience of each individual. It may be total, for a time, from all food, and drink; or it may be a partial abstinence, like Daniel's, in which the pleasure of the table are refused. But, more or less rigid, as each believer shall find it best, the abstinence is but a means to a spiritual end. It is not a mere externalism. As true prayer involves more than the act of kneeling, or repeating a form of words, so it is in fasting. Simple abstinence from food is not a religious service—only a medical regimen. If the heart is all the while going out after the world, and the physical fasting is not made the attendant and help of inward exercises of soul; if sin is still cherished and wickedness indulged, it is all a vain mockery, or hypo-

*The Westminster Confession of the Presbyterian Church, also commends fasting, among other acts of devotion: "Religious oaths, and vows, solemn fastings, and thanksgivings upon special occasions; which are, in their several times and seasons, to be used in an holy and religious manner." Chap. 21, Sec. 5.

critical pretence, before God, just as when one takes the form of prayer, yet does not pray. We might thus multiply fast days, and observe them with Popish or even Mohamedan exactitude and rigor, and yet do nothing acceptable or profitable. It would be but a solemn pretence. A holy God who looks on the heart as well as on the outward appearance, might, and doubtless would, still say to us, as he did to his professing people of old, who practiced the form without the reality, *Is it such a fast that I have chosen?* Is. 58 : 5. Observe, that it is implied even here that there is a fast which God has "chosen;" but it is not "*such*" a one, destitute of the true spirit—a formal afflicting of the soul and bowing of the head like a bulrush, without the spiritual services, in heart and act of judgment, justice and mercy. Such a pretence is an abomination to God. The primary thing, then, is the internal disposition. It is useless if only the body, and not the soul, fasts. It involves true and hearty repentance of sin. It associates itself with godly humiliation, where is found the contrite heart into which God enters as His second heaven. And it implies reformation, in which the spiritual exercise results in a life, meet for repentance.

2. It is evident that this separates all true fasting from the abuses and perversions which have brought it into discredit. It cannot be viewed as a *meritorious service*. It is at this point that the Romish Church has perverted the truth. Its teaching is a delusion, making its own members dupes and other men, mockers and sceptics. It has turned the truth of God into a lie. If fasting be looked upon as meritorious, it would better not be observed. Then it only deludes and destroys. This was the fatal mistake of the Pharisee who went up to the temple to pray, saying, "I fast twice a week." He depended upon it and boasted in it, as a deserving work. Thousands still look on it as meritorious penance, or self-inflicted suffering atoning for sin and earning divine favor. They put it in the place of the Saviour. This is the great error on the subject, against which the condemnation of the Augsburg Confession is leveled. The Reformers were specially careful to uproot the whole Romish doctrine of human merit, as dishonoring Christ and misleading souls. In accordance with the Scriptures, they held up Christ, as the only ground of the sinner's hope. They pointed the eye of faith only to the Redeemer's cross. Rome was teaching the people to *merit* God's grace by penances

and fasting. Against this destructive error, the Confessors opposed the truth; "It is diametrically contrary to the Gospel, either to institute or perform such works with a view to *merit* pardon of sin," Aug. Conf. Art. XXVI. The true doctrine rescues fasting from that abuse. Men have perverted prayer, as well as fasting. They have repeated Pater-nosters, and Ave Marias by the hundred, as meritorious works.

The true doctrine exhibits a merely *formal* observance as equally a perversion of the conception of fasting. Much of its practice that we see is an empty form—the outward abstinence without the inward spirit. This has resulted from a departure from the Scriptural teaching and practice on the subject. It is plain, that throughout the Bible it is held up as an entirely voluntary, or spontaneous service, prompted by the occasion, and the heart of the worshipper. It is evident that neither Christ nor his apostles appointed any permanent and regularly recurring fast-days, or seasons, in the Christian Church. There is not a hint of any such thing. When, how often, and how long, he will fast, is left to each Christian's heart. It is to be emphatically a thing of the heart. It is to be altogether a free-will service. Arbitrarily to fix days and seasons, and leave other time clear of it, is not the Scriptural theory of fasting. It is entirely a human arrangement, and inevitably runs into formality and abuse. When the times and seasons and modes of the service are prescribed by ecclesiastical rule or law, its external part is observed as a matter of course, but not being prompted by the heart, it becomes mostly a heartless thing. This again has been the error of the Romish Church, and to a large extent of the Episcopal Church of both Great Britain and the United States. Friday abstinence and Lent season, are arbitrary arrangements, unknown to the word of God; and their compulsory observance, with general heartlessness has done more than anything else to bring fasting, as a religious act, into disrepute. The external act is generally given as the discharge of the whole duty. But here, too, our Church has taken the Bible position. It has vindicated the principle of true Christian liberty, and released believers from the burden of rigid ecclesiastical ritualism. We have no regular ecclesiastical fasts. The Confession utterly condemns the system. "*We do not object to fasting itself, but to the fact that it is represented as a necessary duty, and that specific days have been fixed for its performance.*" Aug.

Conf. Art. XXVI. Formality is the inevitable consequence of a system of stated fast-days. It is a departure from the Scriptural arrangement. If we give to anything, intended by God as a free-will service, an arbitrary and artificial fixedness, we almost insure a general absence of the true spirit from the observance. Mahomet undertook to regulate the moments when every good Musselman must pray, and the consequence is, that there is a formal prostration all over the land, when the voice from the minarets proclaims the appointed minute. A Missionary to Syria says, "The Moslem prays just as a clock runs down, when it has been wound up. It is a motion of the lip, with which the heart has nothing to do." To insure the proper spirituality of fasting, we must leave it where the New Testament has left it—a voluntary service, prompted by the believer's heart and circumstances. It must be spontaneous and free. This is a vital point in any correct view of the Christian doctrine on this subject.

III. With this view of the duty and nature of Christian fasting, we are prepared to note its *Benefits*. Its uses strongly enforce its observance.

1. As a primary use, incidental to the very nature of the service, it is an appropriate confession of sin, and token of deep and humble repentance. The convicted Saul was three days without eating, Acts 9: 9. The natural effect of sorrow is to diminish appetite. Thus fasting is prompted by penitence and becomes its natural expression. In the Bible it appears largely as a sign of conscious unworthiness and humiliation before God. And under poignant consciousness of sin, and deep abhorrence of it, it is truly appropriate, like David, to chasten the soul with fastings. Such confession of sin is good for the soul, and part of that holy humbling which has the promise of a gracious exaltation.

2. It is helpful in overthrowing the dominion of the carnal nature. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit." Believers are divinely charged to "keep under the body and bring it into subjection." In this idea there is nothing like the old Gnostic heresy, that matter is essentially an evil principle, and that to liberate and elevate the soul, we must persecute, scourge, and lacerate the body. But it goes upon the Christian truth, that there are carnal, sinful tendencies in our fallen nature which are apt to get the mastery of us. The Scriptures call the carnal principle "the flesh." It is the bodily appetites, passions, lusts, and depravities. They ask

for indulgence, and their indulgence gives rise to many of the vices which afflict society, defy God, and wreck men's souls. This carnal principle, though its dominion is broken in the new-birth, has too much influence over even the pious. To mortify and subdue it, is the great object of the spiritual warfare, from the beginning to the close of the conflict. "I keep under my body," said the heroic and persevering Paul. He who indulges the flesh and pampers the appetite from day to day, nourishes an unfriendly principle and gives it strength and supremacy over his better part. He is helping nature to conquer grace. Hence it is found, that habitual luxury, and constant indulgence, are unfavorable to deep and lovely spirituality. Probably the whole history of the Christian church does not show an instance of their combination in the same person. It is true that most lovely piety often shines out in the midst of abounding affluence, but these instances are always marked with the spirit of self-denial. Indeed, we have here the very philosophy of the precept of self-denial. It is no useless self-punishment. It is a laying siege to a stronghold of evil in ourselves. It is the road to complete self-conquest. It is a process through which the grace of Christ binds the strong man and casts him out of his house. It is an assault of the Christian upon the forces of rebellion within him. It is a way of helping the regenerated soul through the strait gate of opposing sensualism, into the fulness of Christian liberty. Sin was lodged in man through eating, and still delights to maintain and strengthen itself through this means. Abstinence opposes the plan of sin. It interdicts the gratification of the flesh, in order to help the aspiring soul in the Godward direction. There is a peculiar food provided for the soul—the bread that has come down from heaven. There are men who abstain from the Eternal Bread and surrender themselves, body and soul, to the food of nature. And it is well for those who are aiming at the development of a life higher than nature, sometimes to abstain from nature's food and turn their longing appetite wholly to the bread of heaven. It is found helpful in fulfilling the charge, "Crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts." It assists in bringing "into subjection" those carnal tendencies that tempt and betray men into sin and vice. It tends directly to "keep under the body," to restrain carnal desires, counteract sensuality, and promote a holy superiority to all those "fleshly lusts that war against the soul." This is a manifest utility of fasting.

3. It also aids devotion by contributing to the activity, vigor and clearness of the mind. There is a mysterious and intimate connection between the mind and body. Experience fully attests the fact that repletion is unfriendly to the highest and best exertions of the intellect. We are all familiar with the relation of dyspepsia to bad tempers, and of dulness to over-eating. So manifest is the influence, that some have imagined a great moral reformation by simple attention to medical dietetics. However extravagant such a notion may be, it is certain that if a man wants the clear, active, and successful use of his mind, he must abstain from indulgence. The Christian's "moderation" should always be known. Yet special fasting is, beyond all controversy, a good preparative to high intellectual effort or holy spiritual exercise. Thus it is the natural auxiliary of prayer and devotion. It unclogs the soul for its higher religious services. Pagan philosophers, when about to meet their opponents in public debate, entered the conflict fasting, to have the free, clear, full, and vigorous use of their minds. And shall not Christians sometimes use this means of enabling them to wait upon God with holy clearness and elevation of thought and affection? "Every man that striveth for the mastery," says Paul, referring to the racers in the Olympic games, "is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we are incorruptible," 1 Cor. 9 : 25.

4. It is evident, that fasting with prayer thus contributes to the higher attainments in piety. It is not to be understood that man has the power either by fasting or any other exercise, to do the work of his own sanctification. It is a divine work. Christ must ever be the believer's sanctification and the Holy Ghost, his sanctifier. Still the divine power works through means, and makes our own efforts and acts of devotion tributary to the result. And in the Scriptures, fasting is put in very close and significant association with eminent piety. Somehow the best men of the Bible are mentioned as having practiced it. Perhaps their being the best is the reason of their practice. And surely their practice had some influence in making them such. The fact, at any rate is plain. The Saviour's words, "This kind can come forth by nothing but prayer and fasting," clearly connects it with extraordinary attainments and achievements. To it belong the mightier works of faith. On it attend the most marvellous achievements of grace. And it is worthy of note that "the three persons who appeared in the glory of the

mount of transfiguration had all performed the extraordinary fast of forty days—Moses, Elijah, and Christ.” It seems to be part of the plan of grace, that the road to pre-eminent attainments shall be through deep and earnest self-abasement. In a season of true fasting, there is peculiar earnestness of religious purpose and fixedness of aim, special heart-searching and crucifixion of sin, prayer and consecration to God, humiliation and hungering after righteousness, and all this must be helpful to Christian holiness. And were there more Christians whose piety would prompt them to fasting and prayer, and whose fasting and prayer would then react, with quickening power, on their piety, we would doubtless have more illustrations of high spiritual attainment—of men ascending the holy mount with Moses and Elijah and Christ.

Now if there is here presented to Christians a means of spiritual improvement, which they have overlooked, neglected, or perhaps despised, should they not correct their practice, and avail themselves of the attainable benefits? If ministers have left this duty untouched in the teachings of the pulpit, and been silent on this part of the counsel of God, should they not amend their way and give to fasting the same degree of prominence that the Scriptures do? It is easy to separate the Scriptural doctrine and practice, sustained by Christ and his apostles and the primitive Church, from the miserable perversion and counterfeit, exhibited in the Romish apostacy and the formal ritualism of the Episcopal Church. Though fasting is not meritorious, it may be profitable. We may have some sins, demons of pride, and avarice, and lust, and unbelief, that refuse to go out but by prayer and fasting. Let us not allow the body to reign over us. If man first symbolized and expressed his allegiance to Satan by eating, it is fitting, that, recalling that fact, we should sometimes refuse to eat, while we pray, “Lord, deliver us from evil.” May we not be stronger in the divine might, and more probably invincible, if, like Christ in the wilderness, we encounter our spiritual foes, after we have been strengthened by fasting and prayer?

Are there any less reasons for fasting now, than there were in former times, when Joshua, and Daniel, and Nehemiah, and Paul fasted? We have the desolations of Zion, and abounding sin, to call us to humiliation and prayer. We have personal, social, and national sins, to mourn over; and

the judgments of God are pressing us sorely. We have enough to weep and mourn and fast over before the Lord. And the days are here, in which the Bridegroom is taken away from us. Will we fulfil His word, "Then shall they fast in those days?"

ARTICLE V.

REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

LVII.

WILLIAM CARPENTER.

The name of William Carpenter will not soon be forgotten in the Lutheran Church. He was eminent, both for his public and private virtues; a man of deep piety and great usefulness, he impressed his character upon the generation, in the midst of which he lived, and left to the Church an inheritance, unsullied by a single stain. His memory is embalmed in many hearts, and will long continue to be cherished with gratitude and reverence.

He was born on the 20th of May, 1762, near Madison, Va., and was the son of William and Mary Carpenter, who were in regular communion with the Lutheran Church, and in early life inculcated upon him the obligations of religion. But of his childhood very little is known. In 1778, in the 16th year of his age, we find him with his brother entering the Revolutionary Army, filled with patriotic ardor, and deeply interested in the principles, involved in the issue. With scarcely a single exception our Lutheran population, at that early day, identified themselves with the interests of freedom, and were ever ready to pledge "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" in support of the holy cause. Earnestly they labored, bravely they fought and magnanimously they offered themselves as sacrifices on their country's altar in that great struggle, which achieved our independence. Young Carpenter was present at the surrender of Lord Cornwallis, and participated in other memorable scenes in our early history, which exerted an influence upon his future

character. He often, in after life, recounted the hardships which he and his fellow-soldiers endured and the great privations which they suffered, frequently subsisting two or three days, without their rations, and then receiving only a meagre allowance of corn-meal; this he would hastily mix with a little water in his handkerchief and, after covering it with oak leaves, would lay on a bed of warm coals, until it was baked. He partook of the homely meal with the greatest zest, and in the retrospect regarded it as the sweetest morsel he had ever eaten. How great the self-denial of our Revolutionary sires, how earnest their devotion to the cause they had espoused, how heroic their services for the support of principles, which, strange to say, some of their descendants, recreant to their trust, are attempting to subvert!

The subject of our sketch remained in the service of his country until the close of the War, and then having felt, that he was called to the ministry of reconciliation, he soon after commenced a course of preparation for the work. Reared under religious influences, and having been faithfully instructed in the precepts and duties of the Christian faith, he was early received, by the rite of Confirmation, into connexion with the Church. His Theological education was most probably conducted under the direction of Rev. Christian Streit,* at the time the Pastor of the Lutheran Church in Winchester, Va., and he was licensed as a minister of the Gospel in the year 1787, by the Synod of Pennsylvania. The first sermon he preached was from the words: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." His first field of labor was in Madison county, Virginia, one of the oldest congregations in the country, having been organized during the period of our colonial history, and rich in association and incident. Here he continued twenty-six years, interested in his work and, the record says, earnest and faithful in the discharge of his duties, at times also having students of Divinity under his care; among the number the Rev. G. D. Flohr,† whose active missionary efforts in Western Virginia resulted in so much good. He would doubtless, have ended his days in this charge had not an importunate call from Kentucky been made for his services, which he could not find it in his heart to refuse. As early as the year 1805 a colony of Lutherans, members of his congregation in Madison, immigrated to the West. In the

*Evangelical Review, Vol. IX. p. 378. †Evangelical Review, Vol. X. p. 573.

wilderness they found no organized Church, no sanctuary, no ordinances, no religious privileges. Attached to the faith of their fathers, so soon as their cabins were erected, they resolved to hold religious meetings in private houses and to encourage one another in their Christian profession, in the maintenance of their Christian integrity. These exercises were regularly held for nearly eight years, although they were without a minister. Subsequently they were organized into a Church. Mr. Carpenter visited them, catechised the children, and administered the Sacraments. But the members of the little flock were anxious to have a permanent Pastor settled among them, to break unto them the bread of life and minister to their spiritual wants. Under the circumstances Mr. Carpenter regarded it his duty to comply with their pressing request and to relinquish a field of labor, in which he was so pleasantly and usefully engaged. In 1813 he removed to the West and entered upon his second charge in Boone county, Kentucky. Here he exercised his ministry twenty years with patriarchal dignity and energy of purpose, till death transferred him to a higher sphere. He died at his residence, near Florence, on the 18th of February, 1833. Universal and profound was the impression of sadness which the bereavement produced in the community. Great and irreparable seemed the loss the Church had sustained in the removal from her service of one of her best Bishops.

The personal appearance of Mr. Carpenter was striking. He was above the ordinary height, tall and slender, and although he attained his three score years and ten he was rather delicate. His children and grand-children are, however, rarely surpassed in stature and physical strength. There was a defect in one of his eyes, which rendered its vision indistinct, but such was the piercing brightness of the other, that nature appeared to furnish an ample compensation for the deficiency. His countenance was very expressive and thoughtful and his manners pleasant and winning, although if occasion required, he could assume sufficient sternness and authority.

He was married in the year 1795 to Mary Aylor, who survived him, not quite two years. From this union there were eleven children, six of whom are still living.

Mr. Carpenter's ministry embraces a period of forty-six years of faithful, pastoral and pulpit labor, which enabled him

to show the Church and the world what manner of spirit he possessed, and to illustrate the power of the principles which he held. The testimony from both his charges is, that he was conscientious in the discharge of his duties, devoted to his work, a sincere, humble Christian, a man of kind heart, of a blameless life and a tireless hand. His character commanded respect, wherever he was known. Among his more prominent traits of character was the deep interest he evinced in the youth of his congregation, and the strong attachment he everywhere awakened. He was their warm friend and enjoyed their confidence. He delighted to notice them whenever he met them. They regarded him with a feeling of reverence, such as we vainly look for at the present time. He labored assiduously to promote their welfare, to benefit them by every means in his power. He dealt faithfully with their souls, never failing to remind them of duty, reprove delinquencies and to urge the truth. There are those still living who remember the opportune admonition, his faithful counsel, the well-deserved rebuke. He was remarkable for his tact, and seemed always ready for the occasion. Once while he was preaching in the country, some thoughtless young men, instead of entering the Church at the appointed time, and quietly taking their seats, gathered at the door and annoyed the congregation. Suddenly he stopped and, raising his voice to its highest pitch, he cried out, "*Draussen sind die Hunde*"—Without are dogs. Such was his manner, such the force of his remark, that it operated like a charm. Order was at once restored. One of the party, now an elder in the Church, says he was so shocked at his conduct, that conviction seized hold of him and from that time he became thoughtful. He also knew so well how to encourage the young, to say the kind and appropriate word, which often proved, in its results, so fruitful of good. On a certain occasion, as he entered the church, meeting a young man, who was very regular in his attendance upon the exercises of the sanctuary and remarkably correct in his deportment, placing his hand on his head he said, "*Benjamin, du bist ein braver Bube.*" That young man has become old and has filled many responsible offices. He is still actively engaged in the service of his Master, and often refers with satisfaction to the influence of this little incident in his early life. Mr. Carpenter was a most laborious, successful Catechist, and a zealous advocate of the system. He delivered lectures in the German and English language. His early ministerial

labors were confined to the German, but in 1820 he commenced preaching in English, because the interests of the Church demanded the change. He was at first violently opposed by some of his members, but when once satisfied, that the course was proper, nothing could deter him from carrying out what he believed was his duty. No man was more independent and fearless. No one was more unwilling than he to connive at even the appearance of evil. No one, more honest in expressing his convictions of truth, whether received or rejected by men. During a warmly contested election, as he was riding towards Burlington to exercise the elective franchise, he was met by two men, who stated they had bet a considerable amount as to the candidate for whom he would vote. The old gentleman replied that he regarded betting as a criminal practice, and exceedingly regretted that he had been the innocent cause of their wickedness. He instantly turned his horse's head and returned home without voting. Thus neither party won the bet, and a wholesome lesson was administered.

He was a man of great uniformity of character, very regular and exemplary in his habits, and of unimpeachable integrity, faithful to whatever trust was committed to him, unwearied in industry and unostentatious in his benevolence. He was incapable of doing any thing of doubtful propriety. He always moved in straight lines. He disdained petty intrigue, and scorned a mean action. His character for purity was above suspicion. He was remarkable for his love of truth, for his honesty and a sensitive regard for what is honorable and of good repute. He was frank, cheerful, generous and just. His habits of life were plain and simple, his affections, warm, earnest and manly. There are many incidents, illustrative of his peculiar traits of character given by those who were brought within the range of his influence. He was, even in his early day, interested in the study of Meteorology, and it was his practice every night before retiring to walk out and observe the clouds. One night he discovered that the door of his corn-crib was open, and on approaching the spot found a thief filling his bag. When the poor fellow ascertained that he was detected, he immediately commenced emptying the sack, but Father Carpenter directed him to fill it, and also helped him to put it on his horse. Now said the good man, "Go and steal no more!" As the perpetrator happened to be a near neighbor, whom he did

not wish to expose, he concealed his name even from his own family, and to this day it is unknown.

On the farm on which he lived, he raised more than was required for his own use. The surplus he disposed of, but he always had a fixed price for his corn. In his day he thought twenty-five cents a fair equivalent for a bushel. He would, however, never sell to speculators. On one occasion corn rose to one dollar per bushel; still he continued to sell in small quantities to his neighbors for twenty-five cents. Some speculators having heard this, brought their teams and proposed to take all that he had at that price. His reply was, "No, you cannot have it, at any price!"

He was distinguished for his love of country. This feeling was manifest on all occasions. He knew from personal experience the sacrifices and toil it required, how much it had cost to secure the blessings of freedom and independence. An actor in the scenes of the American Revolution, he appreciated the privileges which an American citizen enjoyed. The motto which he adopted indicated his ardent patriotism, his earnest devotion to freedom, as the prevailing sentiment of his heart. On the blank leaf of some of his books, are found inscribed the words, *Ubi libertas, ibi patria*. It was the same sentiment which his cotemporary Benjamin Franklin uttered in the Colonial Congress, before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, and repeated at the Court of France.

He continued a member of the Synod of Pennsylvania until his death, although in consequence of the remoteness of his field of labor from the place of meeting, and the few facilities afforded for travelling in those days, he was seldom present. In the *Minutes*, however, we find frequent allusion to his name, and such men, as Dr. Lochman and Dr. Schaeffer, appointed to write to him for the purpose of assuring him of the Synod's high regard and sincere sympathy with him in his labors. At the meeting in 1821, there is a reference to a communication received by the Synod from him, in which he speaks of the restoration of peace to the congregation after the disturbances, caused by the introduction of the English language into the services of the Church. He also states that, as his mind is now relieved from anxiety he has commenced to write a work upon the most important truths of the Christian religion, intended for plainer people.

He exercised the most affectionate personal faith in Christ as his atoning Saviour, and in God as his reconciled Father. He lived for the good of others and for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. When his work was done on earth and the message reached him, death had to him no terrors. That Jesus, whom he had so faithfully served and whom he had so earnestly commended to others, was near to uphold him and to give him the victory. He passed away, as he had lived, in perfect peace, in the full assurance of a peaceful rest beyond the grave.

LVIII.

JOHN CHRISTIAN WILLIAM YEAGER.

The subject of the present sketch was a native of Breslau, Prussia. He was born August 27th, 1783, and in his childhood immigrated to this country. He early connected himself with Zion's Church, Philadelphia, and for several years, gave instruction in the parochial school. Feeling that he was called to the work of the Christian ministry, he studied Theology under the direction of his Pastor, the Rev. Dr. Helmuth. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania, at its meeting in 1819.

Mr. Yeager, at the commencement of his ministry, took charge of our Lutheran interests in Bedford, where he continued in the faithful performance of his duties, until he was disabled by the inroads of disease. Night and day he was engaged in his mission, his errand of love, and many souls were given to his ministry. He was emphatically the Apostle of Lutheranism in Bedford county, and, to his efforts the most of the churches in that region owe their origin. In 1840 he relinquished his connexion with the Bedford, Schellsburg, and other churches, and the last few years of his life his labors were confined to Friends' Cove and the immediate vicinity. His health had become very much impaired by his onerous and manifold duties. His physical constitution gradually began to yield under the influence of excessive labor and constant exposure, a ministry of so much care and toil. The last year of his life, he was very feeble, yet he was still anxious to be employed in the service of his Master, the great work, to which he had consecrated his powers. When he could no longer go out among his people he was in the habit of sending to individuals the publications

of the American Tract Society, writing with his pencil on the margin of the Tract some suitable text of Scripture, or a word of admonition or encouragement. To all who visited him at his home, he had some message from the Gospel to present, some comforting or instructive truth to offer, and by his patience and meekness, his gentleness and goodness, his beautiful and holy example, showed the sincerity of his principles and the influence of religion. He met the final summons not only with quiet submission but with Christian triumph, bearing the most unequivocal testimony to the Redeemer's all-sustaining power and grace, and anticipating with joy the glorious rest, to which death would introduce him. He died April 17th, 1844, in the 62nd year of his age. He was buried beside the Church edifice at Friends' Cove, a large concourse of sorrowing friends, in whose grateful hearts he still lived, gathering around his grave to testify their grief. The solemn occasion was improved by appropriate discourses, delivered by Rev. W. G. Laitzle of the Lutheran, and Rev. J. Ziegler, of the German Reformed Church.

Mr. Yeager was of medium height, but slender, and rather delicately than robustly formed. His voice was feeble, alternated to an unusual degree of fineness, softness and sweetness. Perhaps, it was this that gave origin to the sobriquet of *The sweet preacher of Bedford*, by which he was so generally known. His hair was very black, retaining its color, till the last. He always wore the white cravat, and the black coat which reached down half-way below his knees. In his dress he was neat, without being finical, and presented a marked appearance.

He was twice married. His first wife was the widow Cruse. From this marriage there were two children, William Yeager, M. D. and Godfrey Yeager. He was married, a second time, to Mary Magdalene, the widow of Jacob Schaffer. She survived him several years and recently died, April 4th, 1863, in the 89th year of her age.

Mr. Yeager was highly esteemed for his excellent personal qualities. He was a man of warm and genial spirit, of affectionate disposition, of great tenderness and love, a model of meekness and patience. His heart was as simple and as transparent, as childhood. No one ever suspected him of a sinister motive, of a disingenuous act, or apprehended at his hands the least injustice or wrong. All who knew him loved him. "He was the best man," writes one, "I ever met, so

tender and lovely, so heavenly-minded and apparently walking so near heaven, that I scarcely hope to see his like in this world. He was as much like St. John, as I can well conceive. Few men have lived who had the power to attract more strongly or to bind more tenderly to his own the hearts of warm and loving friends. He was a father to his people, the old rejoiced in him as a friend, the children loved him as a parent, and you could often see him walking the streets with a dozen or more hanging around him, some having hold of his hands and others, of his coat, frisking and playing beneath his smiles. No one could know him without loving him. He was the idol of his family. Any person who wished to see a miniature of heaven had only to spend a few days under his hospitable roof. Such simplicity, affection and harmony are not often met with, in this world."* He was a good man, an earnest living Christian, illustrating in his own life the power and blessedness of the Gospel and uniting with sincere humility active usefulness; visiting the widow and the fatherless in their affliction, he kept himself unspotted from the world. Kind and considerate in his intercourse, affable and always amiable, the savor of his lovely temper rested upon every circle in which he mingled, his example was a regular sermon, his presence a continual benediction. A life so pure and consistent, so much under the control of a meek and benevolent spirit secured for him the most unlimited confidence and sincere affection. He loved the work, to which he had consecrated his life. His whole heart was in the service. He deeply felt the responsibility of his position and was ever diligent in promoting the prosperity of Zion. Preaching Christ was his constant employment, his chief pleasure. Although his field of labor embraced a large territory, which rendered it necessary for him to be constantly in his saddle, yet he never seemed to grow weary. It was quite common for him in filling an appointment in some distant congregation to rise at midnight and start on his journey. He was indefatigable in his labors. His heart went forth in tender sympathy with his flock, and the salvation of souls was the one idea, the single purpose of his ministry. His preaching was characterized by great simplicity and directness. No one could plead more earnestly with sinners, or present more comforting truths to

*Rev. D. H. Focht, New Bloomfield, Pa.

the distressed than he, or awaken in the hearts of believers a greater hungering and thirsting after righteousness, a deeper work of grace and a more intimate communion with God. And his words, which came warm, glowing from the heart, his manner, tones of voice, attitude, were in entire keeping with the service he was rendering to God. He was, as might be expected, eminently successful, not only in guiding inquirers and leading the people of God to higher attainments in piety, but his religious activity was, with the divine blessing, the means of salvation, perhaps, to thousands of souls. His ministry was attended with many powerful effusions of the Holy Spirit and abounded in the most remarkable fruits, the result, as it seemed, of that intense, whole-hearted devotion to the good of his fellow-men and the glory of God, which was the crowning excellence of his life. In the extent, variety and usefulness of his labors he evidently followed the foot-steps of Him, who went about doing good. The influence of his life is still felt, wherever he was known, and an impression of moral worth, heavenly-mindedness, unwavering faith and apostolic zeal has been produced upon the tablet of the memory, which time can never efface. The life of such a man is a blessing to any community, his death a public calamity.

FROM THE REV. HENRY HAVERSTICK,
PROFESSOR IN THE PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL.

PHILADELPHIA, May 27th, 1863.

My Dear Sir : There is no minister of our Church, in the past generation, whose memory I cherish with so much reverence and love. When I was laboring in my first pastoral charge, he was my nearest clerical neighbor, at the distance of thirty miles. But, notwithstanding the distance, he became my dear friend and wise counsellor.

Unless I am mistaken, brother Yeager received his scientific and theological training in the Prussian University, at Breslau. Hence he was qualified, in many respects, for eminence and prominence in the Church. But his actual field of labor was, comparatively, obscure ; it extended over a rugged district of country, where the intelligence of the people was very limited ; and it compelled the pastor to spend a large proportion of his time in the saddle, and not in the study. For example he could not leave his residence in Friends' Cove, without crossing a range of lofty mountains. Then he entered the upper valley of the Juniata, abounding with rough slopes and rocky acclivities. If he proceeded thence to his most distant congregation in Morrison's Cove, he was obliged to cross another range of mountains, more lofty than the first. Thus the transit from the starting-point to the resting-place occupied a large portion of an October day. Of this I can speak from personal experience.

All this, however, was of little moment to one, whose whole heart and soul were in his work. Although never vigorous in body, and at the time of my intimacy decidedly infirm in health, he did not spare his strength, he did not seek to avoid cold or heat, rain or snow. In fact, at the time of my visit to Morrison's Cove, the patriarch of the congregation, who was also our host, assured me, that brother Yeager, unless really sick at home, had never failed to keep every appointment, no matter for what purpose it had been made.

This was one cause of the success of our dear brother, in winning souls to Christ. But there was nothing in his exterior, for this was not even prepossessing to strangers. There was nothing in his pulpit-performances, as far as they addressed themselves merely to the eye and the ear, for his voice was weak, the flow of his words was somewhat broken, and the grace of action was entirely wanting. But he had the more rare gift of presenting thoughts, always earnest in their nature, often profound, always sanctified to their proper end. These were clothed in language, whose very essence was simplicity, so that even a child could understand their import. At the same time they took hold of the heart, because they came warm and flowing from the heart. In fact his appeals, in this respect, were often so irresistible, that I used to compare them to arrows, shot from a well-strung bow, always reaching the conscience, and always causing a deep conviction, that this was a heavenly-minded man.

Time and again, it was my privilege to be with brother Yeager in his family circle, where (for he had married the second time) it was not impossible for occasions of strife or discord to arise. But no where did he enjoy a larger measure of confidence, reverence and love than among those who saw him most frequently, and knew him most intimately. No where have I seen the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, diffusing its influence more thoroughly and harmoniously over an entire household.

Away from the family circle I rode with him on horseback for days in succession. But, as we rode along, I listened with wonder to a constant flow of masterly thoughts and novel ideas, sometimes interspersed with mirthful illustrations, always manifesting the philosopher, the scholar, and the Christian gentleman.

Upon more than one occasion I united with him in the solemn services of the sanctuary, where I saw the wonderful effects that sometimes result from the combined power of childlike simplicity and fervid zeal. This was remarkably the case upon the last occasion when I saw this beloved brother. We had been holding sacramental services in Bedford; and these were accompanied by religious exercises for several successive days. The delivery of the last sermon had been assigned to me; and I believe that I preached with some degree of earnestness and solemnity. But the object was not accomplished, until our dear brother Yeager rose to apply and impress the word that had been spoken. He frankly disclaimed all power of speech, such as men call eloquence; but with such powers as he possessed, he earnestly demanded a hearing, in the name of the living God. Nor was the appeal a fruitless one. In a few minutes the ice was melted; strong hearts were broken; and an earnest cry for mercy pervaded the large congregation.

I did not think that that would be our last meeting upon earth; but I do not grieve that it was so. It is rather a sweet and pleasant reminiscence, that I left my brother absorbed in the great work of his life, adding to the large number of redeemed spirits, who, in the better land, will give the honor, due to their beloved and devoted pastor.

Yours sincerely,

HENRY HAVERSTICK.

FROM THE REV. S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

GETTYSBURG, PA., June 10th, 1863.

Dear Brother: In reply to your request to furnish some reminiscences of the Rev. William Yeager, I remark that my acquaintance with him commenced, whilst I was a student in the University of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, in 1816. For several years we had frequent interviews at the meetings of the "Mosheim Debating Society" of the Lutheran Church, held in the Congregational School-house on Cherry street; and for twenty-five years afterwards, we occasionally met at Synod. Brother Yeager, intellectually considered, was not a great man, nor were his theological attainments extensive or his preaching powers of a superior order. But he was eminently "a good man and full of the Holy Ghost," and "an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile."

In disposition he was rather diffident and retiring; but the love of Christ constrained him to incessant solicitude for the good of souls. The earlier years of his life he spent as teacher in one of the German congregational schools in Philadelphia, where he was distinguished for his fidelity and zeal for the welfare and improvement of his pupils. After he removed to the interior of Pennsylvania and entered the ministry, he was equally distinguished for his devotedness to his Master's work. In the pulpit, as well as out of it, he was characterized by a childlike simplicity of manner, and an unfeigned humility, which not only disarmed all criticism, but also opened the way to the hearts of his hearers, and often enabled him to make a deep impression on them. Without having studied the rule of Horace, "*Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi*," he forcibly exemplified it. When preaching of the love of Christ to our fallen race, he often wept himself; until few of his hearers could abstain from tears. And his entreaties to sinners to embrace the Saviour, were uttered with such manifest sincerity, and urged with such importunate solicitude of manner, that his preaching was often attended with the happiest effects. On the whole, I doubt not, the salutation of the Master may justly be applied to him, "*Well done good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.*"

Fraternally yours.

S. S. SCHMUCKER.

ARTICLE VI.

DR. JOHNSON: HIS WORKS AND HIS REVIEWERS.

By S. Austin Allibone, LL. D., Philadelphia.

"Sir William Temple was the first writer who gave cadence to English prose. Before his time, they were careless of arrangement, and did not mind whether a sentence ended with an important word, or an insignificant word, or with what part of speech it was concluded." A favorite style of Dr. Johnson's was the Anglo-Latin of Sir Thomas Browne, whose "Christian Morals" he edited (with a life of the author) in 1756. The "Monthly Review" for May expresses the opinion that "The Compiler of Sir Thomas' life has animated his narration with many spirited and judicious remarks: as might indeed, be expected from the known abilities of Mr. Johnson." It is natural for us to imitate that which we admire, and if the editor did learn *pondera verborum* from his author he was not illy compensated for his labors. And here, had we space, we should engage in doughty warfare with those hypercritics who took the doctor to task for what they call the introduction of Latinisms, and the excessive use of antitheses. Those who produce the charge of word-making, will have to revive their knowledge of early English vocabularies. But where had been the mighty fault if the author of the first good English Dictionary—the census-taker of our verbal forces—had naturalized a few of the Ancient Romans, and made good English subjects of them? Is it here-sy for our language to be accretive? Then let those who are so fond of "Anglo-Saxon undefiled," amuse themselves, "o' nights," with a page or two of Aldhelm, Ceolfrid of Wearmouth, or Felix of Croyland. Let them read to their families, for week day entertainment, King Alfred's Orosius, and wind up the devotions of the Sabbath with the royal translator's Psalms of David, or the good Alfric's "Paschal Homily." But, no; our learned philologer does not object to an increase of verbal wealth, in general, he only censures an accretion by items, and by individual authority. But, surely, this is paradoxical. Shall we, then, import a language, bodily, under the *imprimatur* of a philological col-

lege, and shall we deny the privilege of membership, only because we happen to know the name of the sponsor? Is the new-born infant to be rejected if we have proof of its respectable parentage, but clasped to our bosoms because a foundling? This is about the weight of the arguments of our erudite censors. It may be very well to tell us that unexceptionable words (as regards the *unde derivatur*) are plenty enough for those who know how to use them. It may sound very conclusive to quote Horace at us, "*Verba provisam rem non invita sequentur* ; but who more ready to borrow from the Greek, when it suited his purpose, than the satirist himself? Moreover, Horace evidently refers to a copious vocabulary *already formed*, and *however formed*, as Cicero's "*Rerum copia*, &c. If we can by judicious naturalization, improve our population, will the wise patriot wall up our coasts? If we add to the happiness of our family circle by harmonious intermarriages, who shall forbid the bans? And, on the same principle, if we can enlarge the agencies of thought by a fuller vocabulary, which shall afford us expressive synonyms, relieve tautology by a chaste metonymy, and enable us to embody the nicer shades of meaning, without verbiage, we shall not be wise if we refuse such treasures, and put a padlock upon our petrified Lexicons! The Birmingham axe is a useful implement, and answers most valuable purposes; but am I therefore to discard the surgeon's lancet, or the soldier's flexible blade? I shall adopt the two latter, although the one be forged in France, and the other wrought in Damascus.

We have little disposition to dwell upon Doctor Johnson as a commentator upon Shakspeare. We will fight manfully for the preface, but after *that*, the point of our lance acknowledges the influence of the attraction of gravitation, and bends earthward. Francis Douce, one of the most erudite of literary antiquarians, thus despatches the critical Doctor, in a few words much to the purpose: "The indefatigable exertions of Messrs. Steevens, Malone, Tyrwhitt, and Mason, will ever be duly appreciated by the true and zealous admirers of Shakspeare's pages. If the name of a celebrated critic and moralist be not included on this occasion, it is because he was certainly unskilled in the knowledge of obsolete customs and expressions. His explanatory notes, therefore, are, generally speaking, the most controvertible of any; but no future editor will discharge his duty to the public, who

shall omit a single sentence of this writer's masterly preface, or of his sound and tasteful characters of the plays of Shakspeare." Again: "No disparagement is meant to the memory or talents of one of the greatest of men, when a protest is here entered against the text of Dr. Johnson."

We well remember our astonishment at Johnson's criticism upon Proteus' speech in the "Two Gentlemen of Verona," where he charges Shakspeare with a blunder in making the enamoured young gallant say

"'Tis but her picture I have yet beheld,
And that hath dazzled my reason's light."

"Why," says the Doctor, "he had had an interview with Silvia, and yet talks of having only seen her picture!" The literal commentator did not make sufficient allowance for the rhetoric of lovers. That there should be much good reading, and much good sense, contained in such a body of notes by such a writer, is a matter of course. The errors and misconceptions which prove the critic's unfitness for his task, afford another proof of what even wise men often forget, that *no amount of genius, no extent of general knowledge, will qualify an author for a particular field without particular preparation*. The "Monthly Review," vol. 33, for 1765, devotes no less than thirty pages to a notice of Johnson's Shakspeare. Our extracts from this critique must be brief, which is the more annoying from the many remarks we should like to quote. "We cannot help thinking it, therefore, a misfortune almost as singular as his [Shakspeare's] merit, that, among so many ingenious scholiasts that have employed themselves in elucidating his writings, barely one of them hath been found in any degree worthy of him. They all seem to have mistaken the route, in which only they could do honor to themselves, or be useful to the reader. Engaged in the piddling task of adjusting quibbles, and restoring conundrums, they have neglected the illustration of characters, sentiments, and situations. Instead of aspiring to trim the ruffled bays that have a little obscured his brow, they have been laboriously and servilely employed in brushing the dirt from his shoes. Instead of strewing flowers and planting fresh laurels, on his tomb, they have been irreverently trampling down the turf, that had otherwise covered his dust with perpetual verdure." This bears rather hard upon Johnson's predecessors, the principal of whom were, Rymer, 1678; Gildon, 1694; Denni,

1693 ; Pope, 1725 ; Theobald, 1726 ; Peck, 1740 ; Sir Thos. Hamner, 1745 ; Grey, 1746 ; Warburton, 1747 ; Upton, 1748 ; Whalley, 1748 ; Edwards, 1748 ; Holt, 1749 ; Charlotte Lennox, 1753-4 ; Cooper, 1755 ; Howard, 1756 ; Capell, 1759 ; Heath, 1765 (the year in which Johnson's edition appeared). In a future paper we may, perhaps, take into consideration the merits of some of these commentators ; at present we have our hands more than full with the corpulent Doctor. From the above rough handling of Shaksperian critics, we can infer nothing as to the Reviewer's opinion of the present commentator : he may go on to say—"although *these* have so signally failed, we have, at last, a commentator worthy of the name. Johnson has admirably succeeded, where others have ignominiously come short &c. "He *might* have said this, true ; but he says nothing of the kind ; *au contraire*, he rates the great man as soundly as he had censured his forerunners. "From the present editor, it is true, we had hoped better things. But what shall we say ? when he himself confesses, that, as to the poetical beauties or defects of his author, he hath not been very diligent to observe them : having given up this part of his design to chance and caprice. This is surely a strange concession to be made by the author of the proposals for printing this work by subscription ! * * But perhaps our editor found the task, of commenting on Shakspeare as a *poet* much more difficult than he had conceived it to be. * * We find little in the first five pages of our editor's preface, but trite and common-place reflections, on our veneration for antiquity, and on the general talents of Shakspeare ; delivered in that pompous style which is so peculiar to himself, and is so much admired by some kind of readers. In some places, however, he is less verbose ; and then he is generally sensible, instructive and entertaining." The Reviewer makes the following fair hit at the editor's castigation of Shakspeare's punning propensities. Johnson remarks that, "A quibble is the golden apple for which he will always turn aside from his career, or step from his elevation. A quibble, poor and barren it is, gave him such delight, that he was content to purchase it, by the sacrifice of reason, propriety, and truth. A quibble was to him the fatal Cleopatra for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it." To which the Reviewer responds, "Doth not this whole paragraph (not all quoted above) serve egregiously to prove,

that, altho' our editor may not be fond of downright punning, he takes full as much delight in starting and hunting down a poor conceit, as he affirms Shakspeare did? We will venture to assert, indeed, that this is a species of quibbling, which, barren and pitiful as it is, seems to give the critic himself so much delight, that he is content to purchase it by the sacrifice of reason, propriety and truth." Again: "He shows, himself to be as indifferent a pleader for Shakspeare as he hath proved *against* him. Nay, we entertain some opinion that the critical Reader will, on a due consideration of what is hereafter advanced, be apt to think Dr. Johnson too little acquainted with the nature and use of the drama, to engage successfully in a dispute of so much difficulty as that which relates to the breach or observation of the dramatic unities." Let not our reader be alarmed by the mention of that time-seasoned war cry to classic battle—the unities. We are not about to plunge him into the subject. For this moderation he may thank us, when we tell him that our Reviewer, after laboring through no less than six pages on the topic, promises the enchanted reader that he will "call again," and resume the subject in a future number. To quote this cheering and refreshing promise *verbatim*, "But we shall here take leave of this performance for the present; deferring our farther remarks, on the editor's misapprehension of the dramatic unities, to another opportunity." Let us not be suspected of depreciating our critic's labors, but "life is short," and Reviews "are long;" and so, indeed, are we, our reader may exclaim: no, men do not exclaim when they are sleeping; so, then, may our reader drawl. The critic keeps his word. He *does* resume the subject, with a witness! Having got the doctor on the floor, he never thinks he has pummelled him enough. "Come on, Macduff!" is the challenge of defiance; and at him he goes, with unity of time, and unity of place, for seven more mortal pages! The doctor had remarked that, "It is false that any representation is mistaken for reality; that any dramatic fable in its materiality was ever credible, or, for a single moment, was ever credited. The objection arising from the impossibility of passing the first hour at Alexandria, and the next at Rome, supposes, that when the play opens the spectator really imagines himself at Alexandria, and believes that his walk to the theatre has been a voyage to Egypt, and that he lives in the days of Antony and Cleopatra. Surely he that

imagines this may imagine more. He that can take the stage at one time for the palace of the Ptolemies, may take it in half an hour for the promontory of Actium. Delusion, if delusion be admitted, has no certain limitation; if the spectator can be once persuaded, that his old acquaintances are Alexander and Cæsar, that a room illuminated with candles is the plain of Pharsalia, or the bank of Granicus, he is in a state of elevation above the reach of reason, or of truth, and from the heights of empyrean poetry, may despise the circumspection of terrestrial nature. There is no reason why a mind thus wandering in ecstasy, should not be a century in that calenture of the brains that can make the stage a field. The truth is, that the spectators are always in their senses, and know, from the first act to the last, that the stage is only a stage, and that the players are only players. They come to hear a certain number of lines recited with just gesture and elegant modulation. The lines relate to some action, and an action must be in some place; but the different actions that complete a story may be in places very remote from each other; and where is the absurdity of allowing that space to represent first, Athens, and then, Sicily, which was always known to be neither Sicily, nor Athens, but a modern theatre? * * If, in the first act, preparations for war against Mithridates are represented to be made in Rome, the event of the war, may, without absurdity, be represented in the catastrophe, as happening in Pontus, we know that there is neither war, nor preparation for war; we know that we are neither in Rome nor Pontus; that neither Mithridates nor Lucullus are before us."

Now, miserably stupid that we are! shall we say that, to us, the doctor's remarks seem very much to the —? But, no, we shall not compromise ourselves. We know how warm the blood gets in these classical tugs, and we all remember that "When *Greek* meets *Greek*, then comes the tug of war." If we proclaim ourselves a unity man, some bigoted anti-unity champion may despatch to the office that awful *cartel*, the "natural enemy" of publishers, "stop my magazine!" Or, again, should we snap our fingers at the unities, a respectful query may be proposed to the Bæotian authorship of this series of papers. Therefore, professing the utmost respect for each learned Hellenist, we proceed to see with what vast deference the doctor's arguments were received by the Reviewer. "Plausible as these arguments may at first sight appear, we will venture to say there is hardly one of

them that does not seem false, or foreign to the purpose." Again, this staunch champion of Aristotle and Horace remarks, "It is surely as difficult for the spectator to conceive himself actually at Elsinore, while he is sitting in Drury Lane theatre, as it is for him to imagine Mr. Garrick, whose face he knows very well, and who talks plain English, should be really Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Dr. Johnson, therefore, may fully prove the impossibility of the drama's being, in its *materiality*, credited, and yet by no means exculpate Shakspeare in the breach of the dramatic unities."

In an other place we have given some account of Dr. W. T. Kenrick, the author of the savage attack upon Goldsmith's "Enquiring into Polite Learning." This Ishmaelite was still at large, and soon pounced upon the new edition of Shakspeare; and in the "Monthly Review" for December, 1765, we find a notice of "A Review of Dr. Johnson's New Edition of Shakspeare: In which the Ignorance or Inattention, of that editor is exposed, and the poet defended from the persecution of his commentators, by W. Kenrick." Now the "Monthly Review," as we have seen, had been sufficiently severe upon the editor; but, whether, as Johnson said of himself with respect to Goldsmith, they would not let any one abuse the doctor beside themselves, or because they thought Kenrick unjust, certain it is, they gave the critic as good as he sent. They speak of "the rough attack which the author of the critical performance now before us hath made on a gentleman of established literary reputation. The *Reviewer* seems to be one of those violent assailants whose aim is not merely to vanquish, but even to *exterminate*, his antagonist. With him, it is not enough that the editor of Shakspeare be proved to have mistaken his own powers and qualifications, when he undertook that arduous task, in which greater men than Dr. Johnson failed of success, but he must also be exposed as a very *pretender* to all literature and science. (See p. 54; where Mr. K. says, it does not appear to him that Dr. J. is master of any one science or any one language.) This is really outrageous! What must the impartial reader think of such extravagance? What, but that Mr. Kenrick is, in controversy, what the North American Indians are in war; and comes armed with the tomahawk and scalping-knife, to slay and to strip the slain, with the barbarity of a Mohawk or a Cherokee."

Kenrick admits that he "can readily foresee, that he shall be thought to have treated both Dr. Johnson and Dr. Warburton with an ill-becoming levity, if not with unmerited severity. * * That he may not be suspected, however, of attempting to injure either from a principle of spleen or resentment, he can safely aver, with regard to both; what another of Dr. Warburton's antagonist's hath declared in respect to him alone; i. e. "That he is personally a stranger to either of these gentlemen; never conversed with them; never saw them; never had the least communication with them of any kind; never hath received or solicited any favor from either; nor, on the other hand, have ever been personally disobliged by them; so that it is impossible this proceeding can have been influenced either by disappointment or resentment." Kenrick then proceeds in this cruel style, "The truth is, that the Reviewer hath always understood it to be an established law in the republic of letters, wisely calculated to restrain the excesses of insult, petulance and ill nature, too apt to shoot up in the splenetic recesses of solitary literature, that every writer should be treated on the same foot of civility, in which, when unprovoked by prior ill usage, he hath been accustomed to treat others. Now, whether he hath treated either of these gentlemen worse than they have treated Shakspeare, he dares appeal to the impartiality of the public; which at whatever low estimation it may rate an author, who hath never set his name to a book; it will hardly think there can be a greater difference between him and this *par nobile fratrum* of commentators, than there is between them and the inimitable writer on whose works they have so freely commented. If the Reviewer hath at any time, indeed, behaved towards these gentlemen with little ceremony, it hath always been when they deserved much less; for it is to be observed, he had nothing to do with the political character of either. He did not think it necessary, therefore, to pay any deference to Dr. Johnson, as his Majesty's pensioner; [unkind cut, oh! savage Kenrick!] nor to Dr. Warburton, as Bishop of Gloucester. Their literary character was all that concerned him; and even, viewing them in this light, he had to respect them only as commentators on Shakspeare. "We would fain linger here, but our limits forbid. Kenrick had a great advantage in criticising these commentators; for assuredly both Johnson and Warburton mistook their vocation when they attempted to illustrate the "immortal bard!"

In the *Monthly Review*, vol. 34, (1766) we find a notice of "A defence of Mr. Kenrick's Review of Dr. Johnson's Shakspeare, containing a number of curious and ludicrous Anecdotes of Literary Biography. By a Friend." The *Monthly Review* remarks: "Those who are the most ready to give offence, by too unguarded a freedom of behaviour, are ever the most impatient to rebuke; and therefore we are not at all surprised to find Mr. K., or his sanguine friend, Mr. R. R. (whoever may be the real author of this pamphlet,) warmly resenting our mild reprehension of Mr. K.'s *rough* attack on the editor of Shakspeare. But it were not wonderful if he should appear to be *nettled*; for he has been stung by a whole nest of literary hornets. He has been attacked, in his turn, by an army of scribblers; and he may possibly have enough to do, to rout them all, notwithstanding his boasted prowess, and his avowed contempt for a myriad of cockle-shell critics: i. e. Reviewers, Magazines, Chroniclers, versemen, and prosemen,—all armed and ranged under the standard of General Johnson. The General, indeed, hath not yet vouchsafed to stir out of his camp; but seems content, for the present at least, with detaching his light troops to harass the enemy."

We may be sure that Johnson's friends were not disposed to sit quietly whilst their leader was thus violently attacked. The war raged so furiously, that the *Monthly Review*, after having vainly read the riot act to the excited combatants, in the June number of the same year, beseeches them to keep the peace:—"An examination of Mr. Kenrick's Review of Mr. Johnson's edition of Shakspeare. That Mr. K. attacked the editor of Shakspeare in such a manner as justly gave offence to every candid reader, is a truth which we believe very few will dispute. For this he has been frequently reprehended by several of the learned editor's friends; whose faint and distant efforts, however, seem to have indicated their fear of coming to close quarters with this furious combatant: but in the present Examiner, we think he hath indeed met with his match, in every respect. If Mr. K. hath grossly treated Mr. Johnson,—in return our anonymous author does not spare Mr. K. but falls on without mercy, retorting on him, as the aggressor in this scandalous controversy, all his violence and outrage. But what hath Shakspeare to do in this chimney-sweepers warfare? Can the difficulties in his immortal writings be solved, and his obscurities illustrated, no where but in *St. Giles*? For shame, gentlemen! If

ye are ambitious of being regarded as gentlemen, do not continue to disgrace the name of literature by such unlettered behaviour! What will the learned abroad, think ye, conclude, if they should chance to hear of your illiberal altercations,—what but that the *literati* of this country, instead of quaffing inspiration at the pure spring of Helicon, had inebriated themselves in the filthy kennels of Grub street?

In 1770, the Doctor must needs meddle with the Wilkes and Luttrell controversy, which he had better have let alone. The exclusion of Wilkes, notwithstanding his large majority of votes, was deemed a violation of the rights of electors; and an alarm for the constitution was entertained throughout the country. The Doctor issued what he intended as a *sedative*, entitled “The False Alarm,” justifying the conduct of the ministry. The pamphlet had a large circulation: viz. 1st edition, Jan. 16th; 2nd, Feb. 6th; and a third, March 13th. Champions on the other side were not wanting, and they did not spare the advocate of the ministry. The author of “The Crisis, in answer to the False Alarm,” writes his *brochure* to show “what astonishing absurdities a blind and servile dependence on ministerial power, will betray the unhappy wretch into, that defends it.” The author of “A Letter to Samuel Johnson, LL. D.” is equally complimentary. “You have ambitiously declared yourself the spitter-forth of that effusion of servility and bombast, and you could not have been concealed.” We may be sure that the “pension” was not forgotten by this amiable scribe. In the next year the Doctor again came to the rescue of the ministry, in his “Thoughts on the late Transactions respecting Falkland’s Islands;” which pamphlet elicited a “A Refutation of ‘Thoughts &c.’ In a letter addressed to the Author, and dedicated to Dr. Samuel Johnson.” The Monthly Review considers that, “This publication fully refutes the fallacious reasonings employed in Dr. J’s pamphlet, and exposes the disingenuity of the Author.”

On the dissolution of Parliament, in 1774, Dr. Johnson again took up the cudgel for the Tories; and in “The Patriot,” addressed to the electors of Great Britain, he attempts to justify the ignoring of the Middlesex election, and the war against the North American colonies. Answers soon appeared in the “Remarks on the Patriot,” and “A Letter to Dr. Samuel Johnson, occasioned by his late Political publications.” The author of the latter does not mince matters, but tells the min-

isterial champion,—“Though you have given evidence of great force and genius, you have, at the same time, discovered such little prejudices, and such bigoted attachments, as would have disgraced a common understanding.”

As the Doctor had declared as early as 1769, of the Americans,—“Sir, they are a race of convicts, and ought to be thankful for anything we allow them short of hanging,—we need not be surprised if six years later he was ready to answer the united complaints of the convicts in Congress assembled. This response appeared under the title of “Taxation no Tyranny; an answer to the Resolutions and Address of the American Congress.” Many pages would be required to give even a hasty view of the controversy which was elicited by this “Answer.” It was published March 7th, (1775,) and in the “Monthly Review” for May, above we find the following responses noticed: 1. An Answer to a Pamphlet, entitled “Taxation no Tyranny,”—addressed to the Author, and to Persons in Power.” This critic is not at all pleased with the pamphlet which he reviews. He declares,—“Though every part of your publication breathes nothing but the spirit of Tyranny, yet there is one passage so audacious, that it deserves to be distinguished. In your 24th page you have these words; ‘An *English Individual* may by the supreme authority be deprived of liberty, and a liberty divested of its powers, for reasons of which that authority is the *sole judge*.’ If one Individual, or one Colony, can be thus deprived, so may all the Colonies together; so may every man in the community. For I defy any man to show where any limitation exists, if any such power be admitted.”

2. Tyranny Unmasked: An Answer to a late Pamphlet entitled, “Taxation no Tyranny.” This author expresses great confidence in the constancy and courage of the Americans. “I have no doubt, if no better alternative be given them, that not only the heroes of Boston, but the much quieter heroes of Philadelphia, will show themselves ready to suffer all things, and *be free*.”

3. Taxation Tyranny: Addressed to Samuel Johnson, LL.D.” Of this the “Monthly Review” remarks: “The style and arguments of this performance frequently deserve commendation; but passages sometimes occur in it, which discover the Author to have not been sufficiently informed of the facts relating to the subjects in dispute.

4. “The Pamphlet entitled ‘Taxation no Tyranny,’ candidly considered, and its arguments and pernicious doctrines ex-

posed and refuted ! "This refutation is extended to almost every sentence of its antagonist's performance. It is, however, generally too cursory, and the writer frequently hastens from one argument to another, before he has exhausted the subject ; and we fear sometimes before he has convinced his readers."

5. "Resistance no Rebellion ; In answer to Dr. Johnson's Taxation no Tyranny." This critic answers the Doctor by way of parody. We need not tell our readers that the "American controversy" was the great theme of the day. Some of the warmest champions of the Colonies, fought for America, directly under the shadow of the British throne.

Mr. Andrew Henderson received with great disgust the Doctor's opinion of matters and things, as recorded in the "Journey to the Western Isles." He addressed a letter to the traveller, which was thus briefly despatched by the Monthly Review, April, 1775 :

"The Frog contending with the Ox."

Months rolled away, and the only answer which Mr. Henderson received was (to indulge in a bull) that most cutting one, none at all. Not disposed to let matters pass by so quietly, in July was published, "A Second Letter to Dr. Samuel Johnson, in which his wicked and opprobrious Invectives are shewn, &c., by Andrew Henderson, Author of the former "letter." The Reviewers comforted him in his troubles as little as before ; they only remark "The Ox has not yet set his foot upon the Frog." In the next month's Review we find that "Taxation no Tyranny" was still vexing the public mind, or certainly the author of *Regulus* could not "sleep on it :"

"A Defence of the Resolutions and Address of the American Congress ; in reply to Taxation no Tyranny, by the author of *Regulus*." This pamphlet contains many very harsh and some very just strictures on the doctrines and tenets ascribed to Dr. J. and which has already been honored with unmerited notice."

About this time the doctor's equanimity was sorely disturbed by a most impudent literary imposture. Boswell gives us an account of it in his own characteristic style. "We got into a boat to cross over to Blackfriars ; and as we moved along the Thames, I talked to him of a little

volume, which altogether unknown to him, was advertised to be published in a few days, under the title of "Johnsoniana, or Bon Mots of Dr. Johnson. *Johnson*. Sir, it is a mighty impudent thing." [It was a jest book, full of indecencies.] *Boswell*. "Pray, sir, could you have no redress if you were to prosecute a publisher for bringing out, under your name, what you never said, and ascribing to you dull stupid nonsense, or making you swear profanely, as many ignorant relators of your *Bon-mots* do?" *Johnson*. "No sir, there will always be some truth mixed with the falsehood, and how can it be ascertained how much is true and how much is false? Besides, Sir, what damages would a jury give me for having been represented as swearing?" *Boswell*. "I think, sir, you should at least disavow such a publication, because the world and posterity might with much plausible foundation say, 'Here is a volume which was publically advertised and came out in Dr. Johnson's own name, and by his silence, was admitted by him to be genuine?'" *Johnson*. "I shall give myself no trouble about the matter." The jest book had a large sale. The Reviewer truly says, "Among the inconveniences attending eminence of station, whether in place, dignity, or wit, those who rank in the latter class, are liable to one that is peculiar to themselves, and perhaps of all others, the most mortifying—that of having their names clapped to an abominable jest book."

Of the "Lives of the English Poets," we have a very favorable notice in the Review, for July 1779. "In the walk of biography and criticism, Dr. Johnson has long been without a rival. It is barely justice to acknowledge that he still maintains his superiority. The present work is no way inferior to the best of his very celebrated productions of the same class." There is a reproof, not undeserved perhaps, of the biographer's injustice to Milton. Nor did censure end with the Reviewer. In the next year appeared, "Remarks on Johnson's Life of Milton," in which pamphlet the war is carried into Africa, by charging Johnson with a connection with the wicked Lauder in his disreputable attempt to prove Milton a plagiarist; with which page of literary scandal some of our readers are doubtless acquainted, and those who are not, we have no time to enlighten. We shall briefly notice other Reviewers of our dogmatic Doctor's works. It must needs be that a severe censor will elicit championship for the censured; and some of the gentlemen who took the critic to task were as little careful as himself to "seek acceptable

words." Of this number was the Rev. Donald McNicol, who conceived great umbrage at some of the remarks in the "Journey to the Hebrides." The "Monthly Reviewers," always ready either to berate or to defend Dr. Johnson, thus notice the "Minister of Lisinore's" strictures. In the present performance, our *young* Author hath attacked a most respectable veteran in literature, with much ill nature, and with a degree of petulance still more intolerable and disgusting than his acrimony. He hath anxiously sought for imperfections in a work where perfection was not attainable. He hath magnified errors and mistakes, which a candid mind would scarcely have perceived ; or if it had perceived, would readily have excused them. "What particularly provoked the worthy Scotch minister, was the following disparaging remark of the Doctor's : "Till the Union made the Scots acquainted with English manners, their tables were as coarse as the feasts of Eskimaux and their houses filthy as the cottages of Hottentots." Mr. McNicol remarks upon this : "In the name of wonder who could have expected such a remark to drop from the pen of a man on whom the witty Lord Chesterfield, many years ago, bestowed the appellation of *Hottentot* ? His Lordship was allowed not only to be a good judge of character, but likewise to have had a good hand at drawing a *likeness*. It was therefore unlucky in our Author to come blundering out with an expression which must call to our remembrance this striking specimen of the noble artist's skill. But I will be bold to affirm, that no man has ever yet seen Dr. Johnson in the act of *feeding*, or beheld the inside of his *cell* in *Fleet Street*, but would think the *feasts of Eskimaux*, or the *cottages of Hottentots*, injured by a comparison." This is all in very bad taste, Mr. McNicol !

The "Lives of The Poets," as might have been anticipated called forth much criticism : accordingly we have, "Cursory Examination of Dr. Johnson's Strictures on the Lyric performances of Gray," which is written with liberality and candor. (Monthly Review.) Another Reviewer favors the public with, "Observations on Dr. Johnson's Life of Hammond," the arguments of which are represented as "spirited, ingenious, and conclusive." Again we have "An inquiry into Some passages in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the Poets. Particularly his observations on Lyric Poetry, and the Odes of Gray. By R. Potter." The "Monthly Review" arraigns him for his "petulance, trespassing in more instances than one, upon good manners." There is no better proof of the execution

of the Doctor's artillery than the violent clamor thus excited, and relieving itself by the medium of these angry pamphlets. But one gentleman was disposed to strike home, and cause the Doctor to look to his own safety. The Monthly Reviewers thus speak of the "Deformities of Dr. Johnson: Selected from his Works. Edinburgh printed. This seems to be the production of some ingenious but angry Scotchman, who has taken great pains to prove, what all the world knows, that there are many exceptionable passages in the writings of Dr. Johnson. There are, however, few spots in this literary luminary now pointed out, that have not been discovered before. So that the present map must be considered rather as a monument of the delineator's malignity, than of his wit. His *personalities* seem to indicate personal provocation; though, perhaps, it may be all pure *nationality*."

The course of this great man was now nearly run. In December of the next year, (1784) he was called to that rest which remaineth for those who cast themselves in humble confidence and with a true faith, upon that mercy which is the sinner's hope and the saint's dependence. We may not doubt that to him the exchange was a happy one. Error there had been in his life—for who is there among the children of men that hath not transgressed? But there was hearty repentance, deep contrition, and fervent faith. He had proved his faith, too by works of charity and deeds of love. He had been, literally, eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame. He had "strengthened him that was ready to perish," and he had "upholden the fallen." His bread had been "dealt to the hungry, and the poor and cast-out he had brought to his house." The promise was fulfilled to him, as it hath ever been to those who rely upon its merciful assurance: "In the time of trouble" God remembered him, and freed him from that "bondage" which had so long held him in "fear of death:" he resigned his soul into the hands of his Creator with filial confidence and triumphant hope!

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

History of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. By John Foster Kirk. Vols. I. and II. Phil. J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. Nothing within the compass of modern literature has been published more

attractive, than the narrative contained in the volumes before us. It is one of absorbing interest. By many the career of Charles the Bold was, for a long time, considered only a romantic episode in the history of Europe, but recent researches have developed many facts in reference to this eventful period, as to present the scenes and the actors in a different light, from that which they formerly occupied. The author, although comparatively unknown, for a long time was associated with the illustrious Prescott, as his amanuensis and reader, who, in his "Philip the Second" generously acknowledges his indebtedness for the aid he received from him in the prosecution of his researches, both by his familiarity with the history and languages of modern Europe and his sagacious criticism. Gifted by nature, trained under the most favorable influences, with the power of patient investigation and that of vivid representation, loving his work and engaging in it with all the zest, so essential to success, Mr. Kirk seems peculiarly fitted for the work which he has undertaken. He always rises to the measure of his subject and, placing himself in genial sympathy with his characters, inspires his readers with something of the same enthusiasm. The style is simple yet rich, the narrative bold and striking, the facts are presented with great discrimination and skill. The work is an honor to the accomplished author, who is destined to take a prominent position among our American historians. An additional volume, now in course of preparation, will complete the history, the appearance of which will be anticipated by the public with deep interest.

The Life and Times of John Huss; or the Bohemian Reformation of the Fifteenth Century, By E. R. Gillet. In two Volumes. Boston Gould & Lincoln, 1863. We cordially welcome this important contribution to our ecclesiastical literature. The theme is one of thrilling interest and full of instruction. The character and influence of Huss, his earnestness of purpose, singleness of aim, his heroic faith and martyr death, as well as the deep interest, which attaches to that memorable struggle for truth and religious freedom, will attract attention to the work. Dr. Gillet has performed his difficult task with ability, judgment and literary taste. These volumes will take their place among standard works upon kindred subjects and reflect the highest honor upon the author and the country which produced him.

Sermons preached before his Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, during his tour in the East, in the Spring of 1862, with notices of some of the localities visited. By A. P. Stanley, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. New York. Charles Scribner. 1863. The interest of these sermons is very much increased by the circumstances and occasion of their delivery. Dr. Stanley was the Chaplain of the Prince of Wales during his excursion through the East and the Holy Land, and on the Lord's Day usually delivered before him and his suite a brief discourse, suggested by the locality, in which they were tarrying on the way. These discourses are followed by copious and valuable sketches of the country and places, the Mosque of Hebron, the Samaritan Passover, Galilee, Hermon and Lebanon, Patmos, accompanied with maps and diagrams of the most interesting scenes visited. The volume is replete with information and abounds with excellent thought, practical and spiritual, expressed in clear and beautiful language.

The Young Parson. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1863. This volume contains a series of incidents and sketches in the pastoral experience of the writer, presented with remarkable fidelity and success, and indicating talent of a high order. There is a rich vein of genuine humor running through the work, whilst many of its scenes are described with great tenderness and pathos. It is a pleasant and profitable book and will everywhere find readers.

Heaven. By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1863. *Heavenly Recognition.* By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. Lindsay & Blakiston. 1863. *Heavenly Home.* By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. Lindsay & Blakiston. 1863. These books have been before the public for some time and have been received with very great favor. They are now presented in a more attractive form, on tinted paper and in elegant binding, worthy of the high reputation which they have enjoyed. The subjects discussed are deeply interesting to all Christians, and serve to bring us nearer the realities of the eternal world. The author has, for many years, been specially interested in these studies and has gathered together a large amount of information respecting the different opinions, which have, from time to time, prevailed with regard to the future life. Without endorsing every sentiment, which the volumes contain, we think they are deserving of the high estimation in which they are held.

The Greek Testament. With a critically revised text: a digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage: prolegomena: and a critical and exegetical commentary. For the use of Theological students and Ministers. By Henry Alford, D. D. In four Volumes. Vol. I. containing the four Gospels. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1859. This work is well known and highly appreciated by the student of the Bible, that it needs no special recommendation. He who has been in the habit of consulting its pages, finds it difficult to dispense with the valuable help, which it furnishes. We are gratified with the prospect, presented of a speedy completion of the American edition.

Memoir of the Life and Character of the late Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen, LL. D. By Talbot W. Chambers, A minister of the Collegiate Church, New York. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863. This is an interesting and faithful portraiture of a great and good man who was long and favorably known to the American public and whose memory will ever be held in affectionate remembrance. Distinguished as an advocate, a statesman, as the presiding officer successively of two Literary Institutions, and the leader of several of our benevolent Societies, his influence was widely felt. In every position which he occupied, the purity of his personal character and the depth of his religious experience were most strikingly exhibited. His life is another illustration of what an intelligent, earnest Christian layman may accomplish, whose heart is unreservedly devoted to God. The narrative by Dr. Chambers is given, without any artistic effect, simply and naturally, and leaves upon the mind a truthful impression of the honored subject.

The Family Bible: containing the Old and New Testaments with brief notes and instructions, designed to give the results of critical investigation and to assist common readers to understand the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the inspired Word, including the references and marginal readings of the Polyglot Bible. Published by the American Tract Society. The object of these notes is to assist common readers to understand the teachings of God's Word by presenting simply and briefly the results of critical and judicious investigation. Appended to each

chapter are practical and instructive suggestions, calculated to awaken serious thought and impress the heart of the reader. We value the work most highly, and recommend it for use in the family and the school.

Memorial of William Kirkland Bacon, late Adjutant of the Twenty-Sixth Regiment of New York State Volunteers. By his Father. Utica, N. Y. Roberts. 1863. This is a beautiful and touching tribute to moral worth and devoted heroism, which no one can read without admiration. The father has executed his task in a spirit of earnest patriotism, Christian faith and humble resignation.

Adjutant Stearns. Boston: Mass. S. S. Society. The subject of this interesting memorial was the son of President Stearns of Amherst College, a young man of rare promise. Influenced by a high sense of duty he relinquished his studies and gave himself to his country. This Christian hero and soldier fell in the sacred cause, near Newbern, N. C. The father has most delicately and affectingly sketched the noble character of his son.

Notes on the Rebel Invasion of Maryland and Pennsylvania and the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1st, 2nd and 3rd, 1863. Accompanied by an explanatory Map. By M. Jacobs, D. D., Professor of Mathematics and Chemistry in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. This is a minute, faithful and graphic account of the Battle of Gettysburg by one who was an eye-witness of most of the scenes which he describes and who is distinguished for his habits of accurate observation. The Chart, which accompanies the narrative, was made from actual measurements of the ground, and is of great value in reaching a proper comprehension of the positions of the two armies. The writer has rendered important service by the publication, which not only possesses a present interest but will furnish valuable materials to the future historian of the War.

The Light and Dark of the Rebellion. Phil. G. W. Childs. 1863. This is another contribution to the literature of the War and contains important material for the future historian. It is an instructive and entertaining book, and although the name of the author does not appear, he earnestly sustains the Government in its efforts to subdue treason and crush the Rebellion. The opinion is strongly maintained that Slavery, or the Union must die.

The Life and Military Career of Thomas Jonathan Jackson, Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Army. By Markinfield Addey. With a Portrait. New York: Charles T. Evans. 1863. We have in this volume a brief narrative of the prominent events in the life of this distinguished rebel General, and of the scenes, with which he was intimately associated in the history of the Great Rebellion. The author is impartial and shows a disposition, neither to magnify nor depreciate the merits of its popular hero. Jackson was a remarkable man. No one in the Southern Army has awakened more enthusiasm and inspired greater confidence. His death was a severe blow to the Rebellion.

Rebellion Record, A Diary of American events. Edited by Frank Moore. New York. G. P. Putnam. This important publication reaches us regularly and becomes increasingly valuable as the War is prolonged. The last number completes the sixth volume. With the plan of the work we have always been pleased. *The Companion to the Rebellion Record*, a supplementary volume, two numbers of which have been issued is illustrated with portraits and contains speeches, reports and other documents connected with the War.